

SMALL GROUP MEETINGS

Instructions: From the Table of Contents below, click on any listing to read the information for the specified meeting.

Table of Contents

List of Small Group Meetings held between August 1, 2001 and December 15, 2001.

Date	Group Name or Affiliation	Region(s) Discussed
-----	Introduction	-----
Aug 7	United States Air Force	South - Vandenberg AFB
Aug 9	United States Marine Corps	South - Camp Pendleton
Aug 20	Lompoc Recreational Anglers	South - Pt. Arguello to Pt. Conception
Aug 21	ISP Alginates	South Central
Aug 22	United States Navy	South - San Clemente Island
Aug 27	Department of Defense	South
Aug 28	Sea Life Supply	South Central
Aug 28	Aquarius Dive Shop	South Central - Monterey Bay
Aug 28	Bamboo Reef Dive Shop	South Central - Monterey Bay
Aug 29	Monterey Bay Dive Center	South Central - Monterey Bay
Sep 4	Monterey CPFV	South Central - Santa Cruz to Pt. Sur
Sep 5	Friends of Ed Ricketts	South Central - Monterey Bay
Sep 5	City of Avalon	South - Catalina Island
Sep 6	Squid Fishery	South Central
Sep 7	Bolinás Rod and Gun Club	North Central - Pt. Reyes and Duxbury
Sep 9	United Anglers and CenCal Divers	South Central
Sep 10	Tide Pool Coalition	South Central - Monterey Bay
Sep 13	Monterey Abalone Company	South Central - Monterey Bay
Sep 13	Monterey Harbormaster	South Central - Monterey Bay
Sep 13	Recreation Diving and CPFV	South Region - Catalina Island
Sep 18	Elkhorn Slough Reserve Center	South Central - Elkhorn Slough
Sep 20	Scientific Supply Collectors	South Central and South

Sep 24	Santa Barbara Recreational Anglers	South
Sep 25	Morro Bay CPFV	South Central - Southern ½
Sep 25	California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference	All Regions
Sep 25	Hopkins Marine Station	South Central - Monterey Bay
Sep 25	Monterey Bay Aquarium	South Central - Monterey Bay
Sep 26	Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project	South - Santa Monica Bay
Sep 27	Environmental Groups	South Central
Sep 28	Santa Cruz Recreational Skiff Anglers	South Central
Oct 1	Recreational Divers	South Central - Pt. Piedras Blancas to Pt. Conception
Oct 2	Santa Cruz CPFV	South Central - North ½
Oct 7	Los Angeles Council of Divers	South
Oct 11	Crescent City Hook and Line Fishermen	North
Oct 11	Humboldt Bay Harbor Recreation and Conservation District	North
Oct 11	Natural Resources Defense Council, Environmental Defense, and other environmental groups	North Central
Oct 16	Small Boat Commercial Salmon Fisherman's Association	North Central
Oct 16	Fisherman's Marketing Association of Bodega Bay	North Central
Oct 23	Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries	South Central
Oct 24	Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries	North Central
Oct 25	Santa Barbara County Fish and Game Commission	South - General and Channel Islands
Oct 26	Mayor of Morro Bay	South Central
Oct 26	Kelp Harvesters	All Regions
Oct 29	Small Skiff Fishery	South Central - Southern ½
Oct 30	Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries	South Central
Nov 1	Monterey County Fish and Game Commission	South Central - Monterey
Nov 7	North Coast Sea Urchin Divers	North and North Central
Nov 7	National Park Service	North
Nov 8	Humboldt State University	North - Humboldt Bay
Nov 13	San Diego Council of Divers	South - San Diego

Nov 13	Morro Bay-Port San Luis Nearshore Fishery	South Central - Southern ½
Nov 13	Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries	South Central - Southern ½
Nov 14	American Oceans Campaign	South
Nov 16	Pacific Abalone Farm	South Central - Monterey Bay
Nov 20	National Park Service	North Central
Nov 27	Humboldt Bay Aquaculture and Commercial Fishing Industries	North - Humboldt Bay
Nov 27	Santa Barbara Commercial Fishing and Environmental Group	South - Pt. Conception to Pt. Dume
Nov 27	Coalition of Organizations for Ocean Life	South Central
Dec 3	Northeast Environmental Center	North
Dec 3	Friends of Ed Ricketts (summary combined with Sep 5)	South Central - Monterey Bay
Dec 11	Shelter Cove Fishing Industry	North - Shelter Cove Area

Introduction

In August 2001 the Department and Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Planning Team began a series of regional meetings with representatives of various constituencies. These “small group” meetings were held to increase public participation in the MLPA process. These meetings were used to inform constituents of the MLPA process and time line, gather information on general concerns, and discuss specific alternatives for MPA siting. Meetings were held on a regional basis and attended by at least one Department MLPA staff member. Though most meetings were small, with between one and 20 constituents present, some had as many as 50.

The Initial Draft Concepts from July 2001 served as a starting point of discussions in the meetings. General comments about the MLPA process were received, and many Site specific comments and alternatives were recorded.

The Department and Planning Team have also received many hundreds of letters, faxes, and emails expressing similar concerns and ideas. Some of these included specific proposals for MPAs within a region, and many had Site-specific comments.

The comments received at each meeting have been summarized below. The summaries were prepared by Department staff and members of the Planning Team. **These summaries represent views and opinions expressed at the meetings and are not necessarily the views of the Department of Fish and Game.**

Each meeting summary consists of two parts:

1. Summary of general comments and concerns
2. Site specific comments and alternatives for MPA siting

The following abbreviations are used throughout:

SMR - State Marine Reserve

SMP - State Marine Park

SMCA - State Marine Conservation Area

CPFV - Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel ("Party Boat")

MPA - Marine Protected Area

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Summary of Small Group Meetings (area discussed in parentheses)

These summaries represent views and opinions expressed at the meetings and are not necessarily the views of the Department of Fish and Game

Aug 07, United States Air Force (Vandenberg AFB)

Site-specific comments only

Conception SMP: A potential alternative included in particular "Safety Zone 4" which runs from the mouth of the Santa Inez River southward to Pt. Arguello and out 3 nautical miles. This area is presently enforced as a no-stopping area by the airforce. It would likely make a good alternative to the proposed Purissima Pt. Reserve, as well as part of the Conception area. They were also amenable to extending southward to include the existing reserve, and as far south as the edge of "Safety Zone 5" which ends just north of the boathouse. The boathouse area is used extensively for recreational fishing and diving.

Regions south of Jalama beach were not discussed, as they are outside VAFB.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Aug 9, United States Marine Corps (Camp Pendleton)

Site-specific comments only

Pendleton SMR: Camp Pendleton requests that no marine protected areas be created adjacent to their base. They have concerns over additional restrictions that would be created due to the Clinton Executive Order on MPAs. This order states that the military must have no impact in any MPA (regardless of designation). They suggested other areas to the south of Pendleton adjacent to two coastal lagoons.

The Base is already restricted due to nesting seabirds, and required to operate below the mean high tide line.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Aug 20, Lompoc Recreational Anglers (Pt. Arguello to Pt. Conception)

General comments only

The group expressed significant concerns over their abilities to fish in this region. These fishermen use the Gaviota Pier as a launch facility and have limited abilities to travel long distances (the launch is a hoist and limits vessel size). They would like some places open to at least recreational fishing in the Conception-Arguello area as well as specific sites near Harris Pt. and Cardwell Pt. on San Miguel Island.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Aug 21, ISP Alginates Inc. (South Central region)

Site-specific comments only

Carmel Bay SMCA:

The Department had incorrectly stated at public workshops that the existing Ecological Reserve would become a SMP without changing regulations, when in fact it would become a SMCA because commercial kelp harvesting is presently allowed. ISP would like to continue to harvest this bed, and the SMCA designation would be appropriate. When informed that some local people have suggested a minor expansion of the Pt. Lobos Ecological Reserve to include Mono Lobo, the area between Monastery Beach and Whalers Cove, ISP did not have a problem with this.

Point Sur SMCA:

This includes a significant portion of one of their leased beds (216). They suggested either allowing kelp harvesting in the proposed SMCA (in the Initial Draft Concept it is not), or shrinking the boundaries to include only the area between Sur Rock and Pt. Sur (about 2 miles of coastline) if kelp harvesting was not allowed. About 90% of their harvest in this bed occurs south of Sur Rock, and they would give up the 10% north of there. Another suggestion for an alternative was to re-locate the SMCA to the north of Pt. Sur, between Hurricane Point and Point Sur.

Salmon Creek SMR:

This proposed area is in an open bed (212) which they traditionally harvest. They suggested moving this site to the south, anywhere from Salmon Cone to Ragged Point, where they do not harvest. Their primary harvest area in this region is from Salmon Cone north to Cape San Martin.

Cambria SMR:

This includes a significant portion of one of their leased beds (208). They recommended moving this proposed SMR to the other side of the Cambria SMCA (to the north), from Pico Rock to San Simeon. There is good kelp habitat there and it is too dangerous for the kelp cutter boats. As an alternative, change the designation to SMCA and allow kelp harvesting.

Cambria SMCA:

This includes a significant portion of one of their leased beds (209). They would prefer the allowance of kelp harvesting within this proposed SMCA. In the south central kelp beds, they generally confine their harvest to the outer half of beds, so a distance from shore restriction is a possibility for a compromise.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Aug 22, United States Navy (San Clemente Island)

General comments only

The Navy feels its ongoing activities (including subtidal explosive use) are inconsistent with protected area status. They would like to provide two alternate sites to the present draft. The first is on the east side, south of our alternative, with a shoreline extent of appx. 6 km.

The second is on the West side extending outward 3 miles from Seal Cove to Lost Point.

They will be providing us with a formal proposal, including specifics on locations, habitats included and reasons for changing. Incidentally, they conducted public scoping in the past year and have information on public requests for locating closed areas. This will be very helpful.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Aug 27, Department of Defense (Southern Region)

General comments only

They will submit a coordinated proposal to the Department.

DoD believes the following language should be substituted for the Military exemption for Marine Protected Areas:

Present Language: This reserve does not intend to limit or restrict U.S. Military exercises in the region.

Proposed Language (DRAFT): Nothing in this [designation] expressly or implicitly precludes, restricts or requires modification of current or future uses of the waters identified as Marine Protected Areas or the lands or waters adjacent to these designated areas by the Department of Defense or its agents.

RATIONALE: DoD believes that language limited to "military activities" can be interpreted as operations or training only, as opposed to encompassing all Department of Defense projects, actions or policies in support of operations and training. For example, the operations at San Clemente Island require a sewage treatment facility. While not expressly part of the training or other missions, the missions could not occur with the buildings/staff supported by the plant. Weapons systems and platforms research, development, test, and

evaluation are another critical component of national defense that needs to be included in any military provision.

The proposed language avoids the problems associated with detailing projects, activities and operations and training by linking the exemption to uses. It also encompasses the reservation of rights contained in the Submerged Lands Act. Further, contractors perform much range work, e.g. an aerospace company testing a new design for a missile. It is important to include "agents" in any language to avoid future claims that State requirements associated with the designations apply to federal contractors or parties acting on behalf of the federal government.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Aug 28, Sea Life Supply Co. (Monterey area)

General comments

This company supplies marine organisms to numerous researcher and laboratories, many of which focus on medical studies on basic cellular and molecular processes that underlie associated learning and memory.

They feel that the proposed legislation threatens to close critical sections of the California coastline to commercial scientific collection, thus making it extremely difficult for their company to continue to collect these animals and meet the demand of the researchers and laboratories they supply.

Site-specific comments

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

They are opposed because they feel it will limit access to vital research animals. See general comment above.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

They are opposed to the proposed because they feels it will limit access to vital research animals. See general comment above.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Aug 28, Aquarius Dive Shop (Monterey area)

Site-specific comments only

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

As long as access to diving is not restricted and the proposed no-fishing regulation applies to both hook-and-line fishermen as well as spearfishermen, this is a good idea. The reason not to allow hook-and-line fishermen is that if you are trying to make this a natural area, you would want to eliminate lost and broken fishing gear on the bottom. Also putting hook-and-line fishermen in same area with a lot of divers may lead to accidental hooking and injury from motor boats.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

They support the initial draft concept

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Aug 29, Bamboo Reef Dive Shop (Monterey area)

Site-specific comments only

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

The conflict between the City of Monterey and Fish and Game concerning prohibition of spearfishing must be resolved before an informed decision can be made on current proposal. It is not fair that hook-and-line fishing is permitted and spearfishing is not. If you are going to restrict fishing it must apply to all take.

As far as cutting out the whole area from the Breakwater to past Hopkins, this limits areas where novice spearfish divers can go. This is much too restrictive.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

One mile offshore will essentially prevent small fishermen from having a place to earn a living when the weather is bad. Just make the restricted area out to a depth of 60'.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Aug 29, Monterey Bay Dive Center (Monterey area)

Site-specific comments only

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR: They support this proposal.

Pacific Grove SMCA: They support this proposal.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 4, Monterey Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels (Santa Cruz to Point Sur)

General comments

CPFVs no longer carry large groups of anglers; 6-10 people per trip is more common now. Thus, cumulative impact is less, particularly in light of reduced sport bag limits and seasonal closures.

The ban on gill nets in nearshore waters which began in the 1980s has caused rockfish populations to recover.

Site-specific comments

Soquel Canyon SMCA:

Representation was not complete from this group. One CPFV operator indicated that this might be acceptable because it leaves open an important fishing location called "Hollywood and Vine". However, another CPFV operator from Monterey who was not present may have some objections to it.

Portuguese Ledge SMCA:

They strongly objected to this. Of all the proposed MPAs in their area, this is one of two that is most crucial to their business. They dispute submersible observations indicating relatively few adult rockfishes here, said that populations of widow, yellowtail and bocaccio rockfishes are particularly abundant there, and that populations have recovered since the gill net days. This is an easily accessed area close to port and is often visited when it is too rough to go farther from port.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

Although as proposed this would not impact them they felt that the impact nearshore from the commercial hook-and-line fishery in recent years was significant.

Point Lobos SMCA:

Since there already is a reserve at Point Lobos, they felt this proposed site would impact them unnecessarily and suggested an alternative site to the south, that being the Soberanes Point area. The point is about 4.5 miles south of Pt. Lobos. There is a 3-mile section of coastline between Lobos Rocks (at Soberanes Point) and Rocky Point that would be a preferred alternative. It has considerable hard bottom habitat and does include a minor canyon head between 2 and 3 miles from shore. However, any proposed MPA outside 1 mile would conflict with trawling: the only area where trawling is allowed within one mile of shore is between Yankee Point and Point Sur, and includes this proposed site. Thus an alternative might be an MPA that extends offshore only 1 mile.

Point Sur SMCA:

This is the other proposed site which is crucial to their business. There is a 100-day period each year when weather allows them to travel to the Point Sur Area for day trips. Fishing is usually excellent here, but when the bite is off on the outer bank they depend on the inshore area, which is included in the proposed SMCA. Two alternatives were suggested:

1. They would not have a problem with a SMCA within 1 mile of shore between Point Sur and Sur Rock (mouth of Big Sur River). This is the same area suggested by ISP Alginates as an acceptable alternative.
2. Establish an SMCA in the Cooper Point area (about 5 miles south of Point Sur). In the Cooper Point to Pfeiffer Point area there is some habitat deeper than 100 fm within 3 miles of shore.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 5 and Dec 3, Friends of Ed Ricketts (Monterey area)General comments

A reserve should be a reserve, with the only exception being an allowance for scientific take for research purposes related to the reserve.

They were concerned about representation at the planned facilitated group discussions and said they would provide input on what they thought would be a good mix for the represented constituents.

They felt that it would be better to have a preferred alternative for an MPA network for each

region rather than roll everything into one package.

They suggested we consider positive as well as negative socioeconomic impacts in any analysis of proposed MPAs.

They stressed the critical importance of having unrestricted access for non-extractive users in any new MPA, and cited the problems with such access at Big Creek. They would like to see specific language that guarantees this access in any regulations for any new MPA as well as for existing MPAs.

They were concerned about increased uses of kelp in future enterprises, including the cattle food business. They believe that alternate food sources should be used, rather than kelp, and that these food sources are economically practical.

Site-specific Comments

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

Unrestricted access for non-extractive uses is critical. A reserve should be a reserve, with the only exception being an allowance for scientific take for research purposes related to the reserve. The reserve should include the Coast Guard breakwater to the east and also extend west of the present Hopkins Marine Life Refuge to Lovers Point. This was originally proposed back in 1993 or 1994 when the two cities (Monterey and Pacific Grove) were jointly considering the establishment of a marine park.

The name should be Ed Ricketts SMR, not Hopkins SMR. Related to scientific collecting, everything that is found within the proposed SMR also occurs at Tankers Reef, a short distance to the east offshore of a sandy beach in 40-60 foot depths.

Local kelp harvesters voluntarily refrained from harvesting kelp for a 4-year period in the mid 90's, so they should not be significantly impacted if they were excluded from this area (currently they are allowed to harvest kelp west of Hopkins Marine Life Refuge and in about half of the proposed SMR east of Hopkins). Proposed offshore depth boundary should remain at 60 feet. The breakwater is the "crown jewel" of diving for the Monterey Peninsula. They do not want angling allowed from the breakwater (which is a public pier by definition in which a fishing license is not needed), due to safety concerns for divers.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 5, City of Avalon (General discussion and Catalina Island)

General comments only

The meeting consisted of a Department overview of the MLPA and approximately 1.5 hours of questions and answers.

Questions revolved around the following major topics:

Timeline and process

Specifics of the proposal (what is in and out) as well as percentage of closed area

Marine Mammal concerns

Enforcement

Socio-economic impact to the city of Avalon

Criteria and method for designation

Lobster fisheries and other “sustainable” uses

Pelagic fishes

How to be involved, should the Island community work as a group

Funding

Access issues, will other activities be allowed

Who specifically came up with MLPA in the first place

The Wrigley Institute staff offered to set up meetings with the Catalina community to discuss options and come up with counter proposals. They will likely ask the Department to attend these meetings. There is a strong feeling of community and awareness that Catalina residents may have different view points than the rest of the State.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 6, Squid Fishery (South Central Region)

General comments

In general, day-of-the-week closures are better at protecting the resource than MPAs. Squid do not return to the same spawning areas every year and one or a few proposed MPAs may be the primary spawning areas in a particular year. Thus they could lose a significant portion of their potential harvest in that year.

Any MPA which restricts squid fishing within 60 ft depth is not problematic and they could live with it, such as the proposed Ed Ricketts SMR.

Their preference would be that in any SMCA in which fishing for pelagic species is allowed, squid should be included in the definition of pelagic species.

They have a concern with how a boundary would be enforced if a purse seine is set around a school in an open area but the net or boat drifts inside a closed area before all of the captured squid are put on the boat.

Site-specific Comments

Año Nuevo SMR:

Oppose designation as is because it is such an important area to them. They could support a small SMR with the inshore boundary from Point Año Nuevo to the next Point 0.75 miles to the north, but with a southern or eastern boundary being a line of longitude from the southern point and a northern boundary of a line of latitude from the northern point. This would make the offshore boundary about 1.75 miles long. Within the proposed SMR, the area south of Point Año Nuevo is relatively more important than the area north of there. As an alternative, they would prefer moving the SMR to somewhere between Franklin Point

and Pescadero Point. Another solution would be to delete the proposed SMCA, change the proposed SMR to an SMCA, and allow squid fishing within the SMCA.

Año Nuevo SMCA:

Would like squid to be included in the list of allowed species. Otherwise this is problematic because this area is one of the important ones in their fishery.

Natural Bridges SMR:

Opposed to this since it includes an important squid fishing area. In general between Pt. Año Nuevo and Point Santa Cruz, the area that would impact them the least with an MPA designation is from Davenport south to Table Bluff, a distance of ca. 3.5 miles.

Natural Bridges SMCA:

Opposed to this unless squid fishing is allowed.

Soquel Canyon SMCA:

Support this area proposal. Not important to their fishery.

Portuguese Ledge SMCA:

Support this area proposal. Not important to their fishery.

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

Support as long as offshore boundary is no deeper than 60 feet.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

Support since squid fishing would continue to be allowed.

Point Lobos SMCA:

Not a problem even if squid remains as prohibited

Point Sur SMCA:

Not a problem even if squid remains as prohibited

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SMR:

Not a problem. Not an important area for them. However, there are some important areas which would impact them if they were chosen as alternate MPA sites:

1. Just south of Pfeiffer Point (Pfeiffer anchorage)
2. From off Esalen to 2 miles south (about half way between Julia Pfeiffer Burns and Big Creek SMRs)

Big Creek SMR:

They support the initial draft concept

Big Creek SMCA:

They support the initial draft concept

Salmon Creek SMR:

They could live with this. However, an alternative suggested by ISP Alginates would cause a significant impact to them. This is the area from Salmon Cone south to Ragged Point. This area is more important than the Pfeiffer anchorage but less important than the Año Nuevo to Santa Cruz area.

Piedras Blancas SMCA:

They support the initial draft concept

Cambria SMR:

They support the initial draft concept, however, another important area for them, in case alternatives are suggested, is from Cayucos to Pt. Buchon, which is largely soft bottom habitat off Morro Bay.

Cambria SMCA:

They support the initial draft concept

Point Buchon SMCA:

They support the initial draft concept, however, another important area to them is from Avila Beach south to Point Sal, again largely soft bottom.

Purisima Point SMCA:

They support the initial draft concept

Conception SMP:

This is their most significant and major concern. The entire area is extremely important with the exception of a 2-mile long area between Pt. Arguello and Rocky Point out to 1 mile from shore. This section would not likely be opposed if squid fishing was prohibited. As an alternative, a closure only in depths less than 60 feet along the entire area would be acceptable.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 7, Bolinas Rod and Gun Club (Point Reyes and Duxbury)General Comments

This club represents over 200 members composed of commercial and recreational fishermen and non-consumptive users. They suggested specific regulatory changes for the area including gear and bag limits for species and types of take. A primary concern is the decline of nearshore rockfish populations, particularly live-fish and CPFV take, requiring extreme management, but limited recreational fishing should be allowed. Many expressed support for the MLPA and the Initial Draft Concepts. There were also questions about the Nearshore Fishery Management Plan, which were directed to the Fish and Game Commission hearings for comment.

Site-specific Comments**Pt. Reyes Headland SMR and Duxbury Reef SMCA:**

The club proposed an alternative to these two MPAs. The proposed boundaries are: from the southeasterly extension of Kale Rod in Bolinas, out to the intersecting lines of latitude 37° 50" and longitude 122° 40" continuing northwest along the 20 fathom line to appoint southeast of Chimney Rock being one nautical mile or 20 fathoms offshore (whichever is furthest) along the Point Reyes Headlands continuing to the northwest boundary being latitude 38°. The present Point Reyes Headlands Reserve, extending 1000 feet offshore from Chimney Rock to the Point Reyes Lighthouse, shall remain in effect (no take).

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 9, United Anglers and Cen Cal Divers (Año Nuevo to Cape San Martin)General comments

The group wanted a clarification and guarantee that there will be no restrictions on non-extractive access for any proposed MPAs unless it is absolutely necessary for a specific

site (the example of potential impact of trampling in intertidal areas was mentioned). They suggested a standard sentence be included with the proposed regulations for each proposed site to guarantee non-extractive access.

They are very much opposed to using the 30-50% MPA option, suggested by the MRWG Science Panel for the Channel Islands, on a statewide basis.

They feel strongly that SMRs should be located remotely from access points for divers, although they could not define a minimum distance from access points. They would not consider the possibility of any additional SMRs close to access points except the proposed Ed Ricketts SMR. They can live with the existing SMR at Point Lobos as exceptions to their stated belief.

Many in the group felt strongly that the entire coast should be a State Marine Conservation Area in which the commercial take of benthic nearshore fishes should be prohibited. Others wanted to see prohibitions on CPFVs within at least some state parks.

Site-specific Comments

Año Nuevo SMR:

They could live with the SMR designation out to 1 mile from shore (as proposed).

Año Nuevo SMCA:

They oppose the initial draft concept.

Natural Bridges SMR:

They oppose this because it is too close to an important shore access point. As an alternative they suggested a nearshore area 5-10 miles north.

Natural Bridges SMCA:

Since this allows recreational finfishing as proposed, they support it and suggested it be extended east to Soquel Point, which would afford more protection from commercial nearshore fishery effort.

Soquel Canyon SMCA:

No strong feelings since this is in deep water. They could support this as proposed, although United Anglers believes that all commercial fishing for tuna with purse seines should be banned within the state waters of Monterey Bay.

Portuguese Ledge SMCA:

No strong feelings since this is in deep water. They could support this as proposed, although United Anglers believes that all commercial fishing for tuna with purse seines should be banned within the state waters of Monterey Bay.

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

They agreed with the Friends of Ed Ricketts proposal to expand the proposed SMR to include all of the breakwater area out to 60 feet depth and the area from the west boundary of Hopkins Marine Life Refuge to Lovers Point. They disagreed with the need of the abalone aquaculturists to harvest kelp commercially there.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

Since recreational finfishing would be allowed, they agreed with the proposal but would like to see it expanded south to Cypress Point (to further restrict the commercial nearshore fishery). They agreed that protection of intertidal invertebrates is an important issue within the originally proposed area.

Carmel Bay SMCA:

They agreed with the proposal and have no problem with commercial kelp harvesting here. However, they feel the SMCA should be expanded to Cypress Point to the north and seaward in the south to the offshore boundary of the existing Point Lobos ER. The cumulative effect of their proposals would be to exclude the commercial nearshore fishery from the Monterey breakwater all the way to the southern boundary of the proposed Point Lobos SMCA (see their comments for this site for suggested alternative boundary).

Point Lobos SMR:

They would like to see the northern boundary expanded to Mono Lobo or even farther to the north side of Monastery Beach. Rationale: Many dive classes use the area and few people fish there now.

Point Lobos SMCA:

They opposed the proposed southern boundary as it restricts their access. They proposed moving it north from Malpas Creek to Yankee Point, which would reduce the shoreline length by about 0.7 miles. They do not want access for consumptive use restricted between Yankee Point and Palo Colorado Canyon, a distance of about 5.5 miles along the shore. This does not leave any significant section of coastline which could be proposed as an SMCA which excludes both commercial and recreational bottom fishing.

Point Sur SMCA:

They opposed this because of access issues. As an alternative they suggested somewhere farther south (e.g. Cooper Point to Pfeiffer Point).

Big Creek SMCA:

Comment about general area: They do not want access for consumptive use restricted from Gamboa Point south to Cape San Martin, a shoreline distance of about 10 miles. This includes access points at Limekiln Creek, Kirk Creek, Mill Creek, and Plaskett Creek. This is an area in which no MPAs exist or were proposed in the Initial Draft Concept.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 10, Tidepool Coalition (Pacific Grove area)

Site-specific comments only

Pacific Grove SMCA:

Their main concern is that collecting in the tide pools along the Pacific Grove area be limited to only scientific collecting that has direct application and benefits to the Pacific Grove area. This would exclude any collecting for school classes, aquariums, or for research which involves organisms that could be collected in other regions. They are therefore in opposition to the current proposed Pacific Grove State Marine Conservation Area because they believe it is not restrictive enough to afford protection to the organisms in the tide pools. They would rather have the area designated a State Marine Reserve. They are also against allowing kelp harvesting in this region but are willing to allow

recreational finfishing from the rocks. They are in support of an petition for an initiative that '.....seeks to prohibit all takings of marine invertebrates and other marine life from the Refuge, except that the City Manager may give written permission for minimal scientific collecting allowed by section 14.04030 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code, with the consent of the Department of Fish and Game. The Initiative does not intend to affect commercial fishing in the Pacific Grove Marine Gardens Fish Refuge. The Initiative would allow the tidelands to remain open to the public and would allow on-site research and recreational hook and line fishing of selected fin fish'.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 13, Monterey Abalone Company (Monterey area)

General comments

In 1998, their company, along with other local abalone growers, voluntarily established a Monterey Kelp Cooperative (MKC) which addresses user conflicts. This group is currently comprised of four harvester members including Monterey Abalone Company, Pacific Abalone Farms, Grillo Enterprises, and US Abalone. The primary purpose of the MKC is to ensure the health of the kelp resource.

Site-specific comments

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

They are willing to support the proposed boundaries and regulations for the Hopkins State Marine Reserve, as long as kelp harvesting is permitted within the reserve. They are also in support of the kelp no-harvest area recently established by Fish and Game regulations between the Coast Guard Breakwater and the Chart House Restaurant. This no-harvest area will serve as a control area (along with Hopkins Marine Life Refuge) to measure the impacts of harvesting in adjacent areas. This is consistent with the stated objective of the Marine Life Protection Act to set aside areas where differences between Marine Protected Areas and harvest areas can be observed and scientifically studied.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

They are supportive of the proposed boundaries and regulations for the Pacific Grove State Marine Conservation Area, as long as kelp harvesting is permitted within the area. The proposed regulations do include the exception to allow kelp harvesting.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 13, Monterey Harbormaster Office (Monterey area)

Site-specific comments only

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

The Harbormaster's office represented the City of Monterey. They are willing to support the proposed boundaries and regulations for the Hopkins State Marine Reserve, with the following exceptions: 1) hook-and-line fishing for finfish not be prohibited, 2) no spearfishing be allowed, and 3) kelp harvesting be permitted within the reserve. They are also in

support of the kelp no-harvest area recently established by Fish and Game regulations between the Coast Guard Breakwater and the Chart House Restaurant. This no-harvest area will serve as a control area (along with Hopkins Marine Life Refuge) to measure the impacts of harvesting in adjacent areas. This is consistent with the stated objective of the Marine Life Protection Act to set aside areas where differences between Marine Protected Areas and harvest areas can be observed and scientifically studied. The City of Monterey is very opposed to prohibiting finfishing from the Coast Guard Breakwater. They cite that this is one of the few easy public access points (also handicap accessible) and that the amount of fish taken is very minimal. No fishing license is required to fish off the Coast Guard Breakwater. Also they are opposed to preventing fishing from recreational skiffs along the kelp beds encompassed by the proposed Reserve. They feel this is one of the few places where small skiff anglers can safely fish.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 13, Recreation Diving and CPFV (Catalina Island and South Region)

General and Site-specific combined

Catalina West End:

This area would be acceptable if recreational fishing for lobster, yellowtail and white seabass were allowed.

Farnsworth Bank:

The constituents expressed a general concern about the effectiveness and problems related to mooring buoys.

Wrigley:

A general concern over size of this area (too big) was expressed. Suggestions were made to not include Bird Rock and to move the eastern boundary westward. A specific suggestion to open the existing invertebrate closure from lions head point to arrow point was made.

Leo Carrillo:

A general concern over size of this area (too big) was expressed. Suggestions were made to move the northern boundary south and the southern boundary north.

Lunada Bay:

This area would be acceptable as a State Marine Park, allowing lobster and finfish, but protecting intertidal inverts.

Point Fermin:

The constituents were generally in agreement that this would make a good educational area.

Crystal Cove and Dana Point

Access was a major concern, no specifics suggestions for changes were made.

La Jolla:

A suggestion was made to have a no-take surrounded by limited take area.

Point Loma:

The group suggested that local San Diego people needed to input on this area. Finally a suggestion was made to replenish Pismo Clams at Zuma beach.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 18, Elkhorn Slough Reserve Advisory Committee (Elkhorn Slough)

Site-specific comments only

A small portion of the slough east of the railroad tracks is already a state-designated Ecological Reserve which restricts all take, except for a clause in the regulations which states "Fishing shall be conducted from only those specific areas of the reserve designated by the department." At present there are no such areas, which leads to the question of which new classification this would default to.

For the rest of Elkhorn Slough, there was no consensus on whether any or all of the area should be recommended for MPA status. A subcommittee was formed to determine if any effort from the group should be directed towards proposing MPA status for all or part of the rest of the Slough.

There is little information about existing consumptive uses in the area. There were questions from some of the members about the need for nominating this region for MPA status.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 20, Scientific Supply Collectors (South Central and South regions)

General comments only

The primary focus of this meeting was to discuss impacts and concerns of scientific collectors who provide specimens for researchers throughout the country. The participants in this meeting all hold both commercial fishing licenses and a variety of permits, as well as scientific collecting permits. They also noted that they are not Marine Aquaria Pet Trade collectors, who sell animals for display purposes.

According to the MLPA and Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act language, "research" and "study" can be permitted. Problems arise, however, based on the overlap between commercial and scientific found in this industry. While the level of take in this industry is low, and all collecting is done by hand or hand net, they are different than an

individual scientific permit holder. They do provide specimens for scientists who may not be able to obtain them themselves.

Several problems with the permitting process for this industry already exist. These problems stem from the fact that they are collecting for research but selling the product. We are, in effect, forcing the collectors to break the law in order to enforce different laws. We are also forcing them, by the requirement of commercial sea urchin permits, to meet commercial landing requirements. This means they must take significantly more urchins than they actually want. We are, in effect, requiring them to waste resources.

The "best" solution might be an entirely different permit process for "Scientific Supply". This would get them out of the scientific collector database and out of the commercial fishing database. Unfortunately new permits take time.

As far as immediate solutions, they suggested the following:

Provide regulatory language allowing "permitted take for scientific purposes." This language could include provisions stating that take within MPAs must be for research, biomedical research, or educational purposes and not for display, aquaria, or food.

Another option would be language specific to their industry, allowing scientific supply collection, if permitted, to occur under the dual authority of a collecting permit and commercial license.

One of the main things to avoid here is either another layer of permitting or the additional paperwork of requiring every biomedical researcher to obtain a permit of their own.

The level of take and overall quantities can be regulated in the existing permit process, as well as the methods.

It is obvious that we need to look into this matter carefully. As far as this group knows, there are only about 5 people in the state in this situation. They reiterated that they should not be confused with, or lumped together with, aquaria pet trade permittees, commercial aquarium collectors, or commercial fishermen. They also wanted it known that the activities supported by scientific collection help to provide information about resource status and environmental health.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 24, Santa Barbara Recreational Anglers (Santa Barbara area)

General comments

This meeting was held at the request of a group of shore-based anglers, who regularly use float tubes, kayaks and other single person small craft. They provided alternatives for the

Campus Pt. and Coal Oil Pt. areas, as well as suggestions for possible MPAs in nearby areas.

Shore access was their primary concern. They thought catch and release fishing was a very good alternative to no take. Artificial lures and barbless hooks were suggested as potential restrictions.

They felt it was important to define "shore based" and whether that included fishing from small craft.

They suggested allowing "human powered, non motorized" as a definition of what types of vessels to allow.

They supported the concept of MPAs in general, but felt that the original concept was too big in scope.

Other issues they brought up included the need for signage and buoy marking, enforcement concerns, and the need for better recreational catch reporting.

Site-specific comments

Coal Oil Point: They proposed a catch and release only reserve for this area. For the West boundary the Goleta Pier was suggested, but there are problems with the pier because of fishing and the boat launch. The tip (end) of the East Goleta Beach parking lot was an alternative. For surf fishermen and shore based (non motorized craft launching from the surf) fishermen this is a highly recognizable landmark. For boats it is not as recognizable but the boundary could either be stated in geographical coordinates, the distance east from the pier, or marked with a buoy. One reason this would be a good boundary is because the sign could be placed right at the end of the parking lot. Most people that fish that area and might not be aware of the regulations access it from the Goleta Beach parking lot. Another reason is that the mouth of the Goleta Slough would also be included in the catch and release area.

Another option for the West Boundary could be the rocky point east of Goleta Pier. For the East boundary it all depends on how large you want to make the area. Spots that come to mind traveling east from the Goleta Beach Parking lot are Hope Ranch Beach (access point) or Arroyo Burro Beach.

Another idea for the cove to allow finfishing, spearfishing, and lobster trapping. With the following restrictions:

Bag Limits:

1 white seabass and 1 or 2 halibut and 0 bass (kelp, barred sand, spotted sand) and 0 rockfish, all other species the same as current regulations.

Gear:

Artificial lures or spearfishing only as well as lobster traps

Boundaries:

End of the west Goleta Beach parking lot (again - an excellent place for a sign stating the regulations) and Campus Point.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 25, Morro Bay/Port San Luis Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels (Pt. Sur to Pt. Conception)

General comments only

They do not support any additional MPAs. They consider the phrase in MLPA “to improve the array of MPAs” to mean only use the existing MPAs, work with them, evaluate them, and possibly expand some of them. They questioned how the MLPA Planning Team got to the Initial Draft Concept recommendations based on what they read in MLPA.

They were also concerned that effort outside of MPAs would be reduced proportionately to the area set aside, as suggested in the draft Nearshore Fisheries Management Plan.

They think pinniped predation on any enhanced fish populations within MPAs would counteract the presumed benefits to fishing from MPAs.

They want proof that MPAs will help sustain or improve fisheries and do not see any science that shows this.

They are concerned as to how any new MPAs will be monitored without dedicated funding. If there are going to be MPAs, “there had better be people to study them”. They would like their vessels to be used as charter vessels for research and monitoring studies within MPAs.

Their CPFV business has been hit so hard with other fishing regulations that any further negative impact from MPAs would put them out of business. We need to manage existing fisheries without any more MPAs.

They believe past unregulated commercial fisheries have caused the problems we are facing today with our fisheries, and that the commercial live fish fishery is still a problem.

They were willing to look at specific sites and offer comments, realizing that some additional MPAs may be inevitable and they want their opinion to count.

In general, they do not want any State Marine Reserves within 15 miles of their three ports (Morro Bay, Port San Luis, and San Simeon, the latter of which will re-open most likely by the end of the year for CPFV trips) due to potential negative socioeconomic impacts on day trips. They would support State Marine Parks near harbors.

Site-specific Comments

Point Sur SMCA:

They are opposed due to its value as a sheltered and excellent fishing location for their 2-day trips. However, they might support a smaller SMCA closed to bottom fishing within 1 mile of shore somewhere north of Pfeiffer Point and south of Point Sur. The area south of Pfeiffer Point down to Big Creek is important to them.

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SMR:

They oppose this due to economic reasons but would support a SMP designation

Big Creek SMR:

They support the initial draft concept

Big Creek SMCA:

Support as is. This is consistent with their idea of using existing MPAs only and possibly expanding them.

Salmon Creek SMR:

They oppose this because it is one of the two best halibut spots on the central coast and also excellent for rockfish. As an alternative they might support an SMR north of the two White Rocks and south of Cape San Martin. Another alternative would be between Tide Rock and Lopez Point, although this is getting fairly close to Big Creek.

Piedras Blancas SMCA:

They oppose this because it is the other best halibut spot and is also an important rockfish area for them. As an alternative, they would support an intertidal-only MPA.

Cambria SMR:

There would be some impact to them but it could possibly be acceptable.

Cambria SMCA:

No problem for them because as proposed it permits recreational fishing.

Point Buchon SMCA:

They strongly oppose due to economic impact. This area is too close to both of their ports. However, due to very recent designation of a no-boat area established within 1 mile of Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant, an alternative would be an area from Lion Rock to the south jetty of the power plant and out to 1 mile. Another alternative would be to change the designation to a State Marine Park.

Purisima Point SMCA:

They basically have no problem with this as proposed. However, they are strongly opposed to the designation of the Pt. Sal area as an alternative to the above or as an additional MPA. This is too important for day trips from Port San Luis.

Conception SMP:

This area is too large as proposed. Could support some areas as SMP if all recreational take was allowed, not just from shore. This area is also used by skiff anglers launching from Gaviota Pier, weather permitting.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

[Sep 25, California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference](#) (general discussion)

General discussion only

A very brief presentation was given regarding the history, timeline, and requirements of the MLPA and MRWG processes.

Questions were addressed regarding Port and Harbor involvement in the process.

CMANC has an adhoc committee that may be useful to coordinate with.

They suggested the Department attend their February meeting in Santa Barbara.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

[Sep 25, Hopkins Marine Station](#) (Monterey area)

Site-specific comments only

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

Hopkins Marine Station is willing to support the proposed boundaries and regulations for the Hopkins State Marine Reserve, with the following exceptions: 1) scientific collecting within the boundaries of the existing Hopkins/Stanford Reserve (established 1931) would continue by researchers that are affiliated with the Hopkins/Stanford Marine Station, 2) kayaks passing through the Hopkins/Stanford Reserve must navigate on the seaward side of the rocks off Hopkins (so as not to disturb the seals and sea lions) and 3) no kelp harvesting would be permitted within the existing Hopkins/Stanford Reserve. They are in support of the kelp no-harvest area recently established by Fish and Game regulations between the Coast Guard Breakwater and the Chart House Restaurant. This no-harvest area will serve as a control area (along with Hopkins Marine Life Refuge) to measure the impacts of harvesting in adjacent areas. This is consistent with the stated objective of the Marine Life Protection Act to set aside areas where differences between Marine Protected Areas and harvest areas can be observed and scientifically studied. Additionally they suggest that the western offshore boundary be extended to Lover's Point.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

Hopkins is supportive of the proposed boundaries and regulations for the Pacific Grove State Marine Conservation Area, as long as scientific collecting is permitted within the area.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

[Sep 25, Monterey Bay Aquarium](#) (Monterey area)

Site-specific comments only

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

The Monterey Bay Aquarium (MBA) is willing to support the proposed boundaries and regulations for the Hopkins State Marine Reserve. They have and are willing to continue to not do any scientific collecting in this area. They are in support of the kelp no-harvest area

recently established by Fish and Game regulations between the Coast Guard Breakwater and the Chart House Restaurant. This no-harvest area will serve as a control area (along with Hopkins Marine Life Refuge) to measure the impacts of harvesting in adjacent areas. This is consistent with the stated objective of the Marine Life Protection Act to set aside areas where differences between Marine Protected Areas and harvest areas can be observed and scientifically studied. Additionally they suggest that the western offshore boundary be extended to Lover's Point.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

The aquarium is supportive of the proposed boundaries and regulations for the Pacific Grove State Marine Conservation Area, as long as scientific collecting is permitted within the area.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 26, Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project (general discussion)

General discussion only

A brief presentation was given focusing on the MLPA background, timeline, and future public participation.

A brief question and answer period was held, discussing the science of MPAs and needs for Santa Monica Bay.

Concerns were raised about the need for large scale MPAs and coordinated water quality protection.

The group expressed an interest in meeting with the Southern California Planning team members to discuss potential changes and additions to the initial draft.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 27, Environmental Groups (entire region)

General comments

They felt that the Planning Team should make it clear at future public workshops, if we keep the same format, that anyone who has a perspective can speak. They felt we implied that only those with a burning desire to address the crowd could do so. They felt there was inconsistency among small group discussion moderators; some were too timid, for example.

They had some ideas about the new time line and how facilitated constituent group discussions could occur.

They suggested that the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary staff could help us with any socioeconomic analysis, and also recommended involving bait shop and rental skiff

shop owners to find out the most valuable recreational fishing sites.

They felt that we should make it clear that any MPAs (SMR and SMCA) adopted in this process should count in the nearshore FMP.

They are concerned that we have no proposed SMRs that extend out to 3 miles from shore (only SMCAs). They feel that only this designation will protect all varieties of habitats, including the pelagic zones and their processes and relationships, e.g. forage fish species and squid.

Site-specific comments

Año Nuevo SMR:

An important conservation area due to its “unique habitat”, including its function as an upwelling area and a marine mammal haulout. They are concerned with impacts of fishing gear on marine mammals and of impacts on bottom from anchoring. Suggested permanent mooring buoys in the anchorage area. Concerned with impact of squid light boats on bird nesting areas, another reason to suggest larger SMR area.

Año Nuevo SMCA:

An important conservation area due to its “unique habitat”, including its function as an upwelling area and a marine mammal haulout. The SMCA should be a State Marine Reserve with full protection. Concerned with impact of squid light boats on bird nesting areas.

Natural Bridges SMR:

Suggested moving both the SMR and the Natural Bridges SMCA north to the area from just south of Table Rock to Davenport, provided habitat had similar value. Would also like to see a larger (i.e. longer shoreline length but still out to 1 mile) SMR to protect fishes which move more than 3-4 km. They are concerned in general that there are no SMRs proposed from Natural Bridges to Ed Ricketts. They would also like to see a SMR in the Pleasure Point area near Santa Cruz. This was recommended by the local chapter of the SurfRider Foundation. It contains a kelp bed, and they realize it would impact U.S. abalone's ability to harvest kelp.

Natural Bridges SMCA:

Suggested moving both the Natural Bridges SMR and SMCA north to the area from just south of Table Rock to Davenport, provided habitat had similar value.

Soquel Canyon SMCA:

Would like at least part of this or Portuguese Ledge to be an SMR to protect all habitats fully. We have no deep-water habitats in proposed SMRs. Part of Soquel Canyon SMCA should extend offshore to state water boundary.

Portuguese Ledge SMCA:

Would like at least part of this or Portuguese Ledge to be an SMR to protect all habitats fully. They did not realize Portuguese Ledge was an important recreational (CPFV) fishing spot.

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

Agree with full reserve status for this proposal. They would like to see depth extension to 70 feet, but realize this would cause problems with other fisheries.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

Should be upgraded to SMP or SMR.

Carmel Bay SMCA:

Should be designated as SMR due to unique deep-water habitat. See their comments for Point Lobos SMR for alternative.

Point Lobos SMR:

As an alternative to above, they would support an expansion of this SMR to include Mono Lobo (the southern portion of Monastery Beach). They would like this area expanded to include offshore pinnacles and make boundaries more easy to understand.

Point Lobos SMCA:

A portion of this should be upgraded to SMR. As an alternative to an expansion of Point Lobos SMR and/or upgrade of Point Lobos SMCA to SMR, they proposed creating a rather large SMR from Soberanes Point south to Hurricane Point (offshore extent not specified).

Point Sur SMCA:

This is a critical area for conservation value. They would accept the proposal as is. In general from here to the south there should be relatively more SMRs since there would be "less socioeconomic impact" on consumptive users.

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SMR:

Should expand this to the north and out to 3 miles to include Partington Canyon.

Big Creek SMR:

They support the initial draft concept

Big Creek SMCA:

Should designate entire area as SMR. There should be more deep-water SMRs. They would like to see a SMR in the Mill Creek area to protect "populations of depressed rockfishes". They would also like to see a SMR in the Cape San Martin area (suggested to them earlier by Adventure Sports in Santa Cruz)

Salmon Creek SMR:

Expand to 2 miles offshore to meet goals of MLPA.

Piedras Blancas SMCA:

They would like to see this as a SMR, since it is an important area for intertidal species and an elephant seal haulout.

Cambria SMR:

Suggested expanding SMR north by 2 km but deleting SMCA. This would be consistent with restrictions along other portions of this region. They also suggested a large intertidal SMR from San Simeon to Point Estero.

Cambria SMCA:

Suggested expanding SMR north by 2 km but deleting SMCA. This would be consistent with restrictions along other portions of this region.

Point Buchon SMCA:

They would like to see northern boundary expanded 2 km northward to incorporate all of the Point as well as the kelp forest that extends to the north and is contiguous with the one in the original proposed area.

Purisima Point SMCA:

They would like to see a SMR somewhere from Point Arguello to Point Sal because of the excellent rocky habitat.

Conception SMP:

They would like to see a large SMR here because it is a “highly important biological area”.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Sep 28, Recreational Skiff Anglers & Commercial Spot Prawn Fisherman (Año Nuevo to Soquel)

General comments

They believe we should have clearly defined goals and objectives for each proposed MPA, such as habitat preservation and fisheries management, and include a list of species that we are thing to protect/manage. They cited MLPA, Section 2857(b)(1) and (2) as being the only objectives in the MLPA (as opposed to the six goals).

They believe that the above objectives do not imply that State Marine Reserves have to be used in the preferred alternative, but rather SMPs and SMCAs with specific fishing regulations to protect certain species would suffice.

They were concerned about the lack or shortness of notification of our meetings and the MLPA process in general, particularly for recreational anglers. They suggested posting flyers in bait and tackle stores. Unfortunately it will be hard to find individuals who represent large numbers of recreational skiff and shore anglers, as they are not an organized group.

Regarding facilitated group discussions, they would prefer separating Monterey and Santa Cruz areas within the South Central Region (separate meetings).

They asked how effects from implementing new MPAs can be separated from those of new regulations, particularly if both are implemented at the same time.

They asked how we define habitat protection other than as a fishery management tool. They believe the only definition relative to the MLPA involves protection from damaging fishing practices.

They believe that SMPs and SMCAS should be implemented first, then SMRs only on a case-by-case and as-needed basis. Phasing in should be part of the adaptive management plan referred to in MLPA.

They would like to see a direct connection to the MLPA process through the use of a statewide advisory committee.

They believe that white sea bass should be included with salmon and pelagic species in allowed take within SMCAs. They believe we should define one category which combines highly migratory and pelagic species.

Site-specific comments

Año Nuevo SMR:

Their preferred option would be to establish a very small SMR (the only SMR they supported in this region) from Pt. Año Nuevo to Bight Point. This includes the elephant sea haulout area but is only about 0.75 miles long. They might support this out to 1 mile offshore. They believe the rest of the proposed SMR should be deleted. As an alternative they would support a SMP designation with catch and release for black rockfish, since the Team indicated this was a species of concern here.

Año Nuevo SMCA:

They supported this, since it is basically too deep for skiff fishing and they realized rockfish cannot be successfully released at these depths.

Natural Bridges SMR:

They are totally opposed to this because it would be too great an impact on the local skiff anglers. As an alternative they would support a SMP designation here with no specific recreational fishing restrictions.

Natural Bridges SMCA:

They support this since it allows recreational fishing as proposed.

They would also oppose any SMR designation for any area from Año Nuevo south to the Santa Cruz Harbor due to the potential impact on recreational skiff fishing.

Soquel Canyon SMCA:

Generally support this, but would like to add white seabass to the list of allowed species for take.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 1, Recreational Divers (Piedras Blancas to Pt. Conception)

General comments

They are still concerned about the lack of public input. They feel that we do not have the public's confidence. However, it will help greatly when we come back with a significantly revised draft concept, particularly if the revision incorporates less area within MPAs and/or fewer MPAs. Many people perceive this process as one primarily dealing with fishery management. We discussed the coordination with the nearshore FMP process.

They support more than one regional facilitated group discussion with all constituents represented. They feel that subregional meetings would be more helpful, particularly after they were informed of the additional Department staff added to MLPA. They feel that the Lompoc area divers and skiff anglers (or more generally from Gaviota to Point Sal) have not been represented. They suggested Lompoc and Morro Bay areas should have separate facilitated meetings with constituent representatives.

They suggested that we collate information from the small group discussions and provide it at, or preferably before, the facilitated meetings.

They suggested developing a computer-based public input data base, where individuals could check off concerns, but agreed that environmental interests might over-weight the “votes” since they are so well organized.

They believe that white sea bass should be included in the list of allowable non-benthic species in SMCAs, since it is highly migratory.

Site-specific comments

Piedras Blancas SMCA:

They strongly oppose any restrictions on extractive recreational use from the point south, but could possibly agree to restrictions to the north where conditions are less user friendly. They suggested looking at areas in which shore access is restricted (i.e. Hearst Ranch private property in the San Simeon area).

Cambria SMR:

They oppose this because it is close to an important access point in Cambria (small cove where skiffs can be launched). Between Pt. Estero and Von Helm Rock is all excellent dive territory, but south of the south boundary of this proposed SMR might be acceptable as an alternative because access is more restricted.

Cambria SMCA:

They support this because the proposed regulations allow recreational harvest.

Point Buchon SMCA:

They oppose this as is, but when informed of the alternative site due to national security (within 1 mile of Diablo Canyon) they all thought that would be a great idea. The area from 1 mile north of Diablo Canyon to Pt. Buchon is a valuable dive area, and Spooners Cove is an important access site.

Purisima Point SMCA:

They support this as is (fishing from shore only). Since access is restricted from shore due to Vandenberg, they would not be significantly impacted, and realize it is good subtidal habitat to protect.

Conception SMP:

They have a major problem with this proposal, which they feel is much too big and too restrictive. They have a major problem with the proposed prohibition on invertebrate take (lobster area), and a major problem if shore based fishing is defined as “feet on the shore”. Some of them launch inflatables with engines from Jalama and go north. They would support this if all forms of recreational fishing were allowed within the park. They feel this area gets such little fishing pressure overall that it could easily support a SMP status with no recreational fishing restrictions. As an alternative, they could support a SMR within one mile of shore from just north of the boat house, around Arguello, to Pedernales point, since this area is already off-limits from shore. They said that Vandenberg closes all waters offshore for missile launches, but the closures are infrequent, one single-day closures, and people are given several days advance notice.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 2, Santa Cruz Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels (Año Nuevo to Monterey)

General comments

They do not want any more MPAs. They think we are interpreting MLPA incorrectly and that additional MPAs are not required (citing the word “improved” relative to MPAs). They would rather spread out fishing effort in all existing open areas

They think there needs to be research on habitats at each candidate site prior to consideration for MPA status. They thought that all these sites were being proposed because of degraded habitats.

User groups need to be involved in the process.

If we want to protect habitat, the area should be closed to all users (extractive and non-extractive). They believe that protection or restoration of habitats is the primary objective of these MPAs.

They are very concerned about additional fishing regulations and see MPAs as an added layer of regulations.

They believe that if we want to protect bottom habitat, we should not exclude sport fishers that do not impact or disturb bottom habitats.

They are concerned of a cascading effect of MPAs; i.e., once some are put in place, others will follow.

They think that a catch/release program is feasible with fishes caught within 3 mile of coast (i.e., they think that most rockfishes will survive catch and release in state waters).

They are concerned with adequate enforcement of MPAs once they are in place. They do not believe that we are effectively managing and enforcing existing MPAs.

Several participants thought there is absolutely no indication of depletion of fish species; another stated that in his lengthy experience fishing this coast there has been a clear depletion of fish.

Site-specific comments

Año Nuevo SMR:

They are opposed to this. They suggested as an alternative a straight line closure inside of a line from Franklin Point to Pt. Año Nuevo. This is a small shallow area but it would protect some nearshore fishes. They have less of a concern with the area from 150 feet deep out to 3 miles; their primary CPFV fishing in this area is from 30 to 150 feet deep. In general, from the north end of Monterey Bay up to Año Nuevo there is relatively little rock habitat (compared to south Monterey Bay and Big Sur coast). Consequently, we need to take that into account when proposing MPAs in these areas to the Santa Cruz fleet. i.e. we should have relatively more soft bottom in proposed MPAs than hard bottom.

Año Nuevo SMCA:

They are opposed to this. However, they have less of a concern with the area from 150 feet deep out to 3 miles; their primary CPFV fishing in this area is from 30 to 150 feet deep.

Natural Bridges SMR:

They are concerned that individual sport fishers with small skiffs will be adversely affected by the Natural Bridges SMR because of its proximity to port. They suggest an alternative site at China Ladder off Greyhound Rock. They also offered that the stretch of coast from Scott Creek to Waddell is the least fished area of the coast.

Soquel Canyon SMCA:

The representatives that were present do not fish there often. However, Stagnaro's fleet (which was not represented) fishes deep water more frequently, and it is likely that they would oppose this site, as well as any proposed sites in deeper water north of Santa Cruz.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 07, Los Angeles Council of Divers (general discussion)General comments only

The attendees had a number of general questions about MLPA MPA's including:
Enforcement- how will these be adequately enforced given limited resources for such activity?

Implementation:

will the Department have the resources to properly implement these MPA's?

Estuaries:

why no estuarine areas included in initial concept?

Water quality:

will these MPA's address water quality and/or what benefit will they be if they can't affect water quality and other non-fishing impacts?

Access:

what effects on general access to the coast might these MPA's produce? Concerned that MPA's might be used by some entities to further limit access in some areas where there have been long term difficulties or resistance to improved coastal access.

Transit:

how will issue of transit in MPA's, especially when possessing catch from other areas, be addressed?

Next version of draft concept- how will it look compared to current concept?

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 11, Crescent City Hook and Line Fishermen (North Region)

General comments

This group feels that limited entry proposals, decreasing allocations and reduction in fishing pressure in the northern area would make closures unnecessary. Commercial and recreational fishermen are not in conflict in this area.

Site-specific comments

Alternative sites include:

1. The rocky shoreline north of the Smith River (Pyramid Pt.) to the Oregon border. This area is rarely fished by Crescent City vessels, and can be observed onshore from Highway 101.
2. Reading Rock might be acceptable to most of the Crescent City and Trinidad hook and line fleet; however, this area is a popular spot for commercial Dungeness crab fishing and trawlers can legally drag their nets inshore of the rock just outside of the 3 mi. line from the mainland shore.
3. Mussel Pt. (inshore of Reading Rock) features exposed rock and some hard bottom habitat somewhat similar to the Initial Draft Concept Patricks Point proposal. (This area combined with the offshore Reading Rock habitat could be considered another alternative.)
4. False Klamath Cove (inshore of False Klamath Rock and Wilson Rock) just north of the mouth of the Klamath has exposed rock and some hard bottom habitat. One suggestion is to have a reserve boundary a straight line drawn from point to point at the cove (approx. .3 square mi.). Another design would be to have a line drawn from both north and south points to Wilson Rock forming a triangle (approx. .92 square mi.). The area west of Wilson and False Klamath Rocks are considered important fishing grounds.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 11, Humboldt Bay Harbor Recreation and Conservation District (Humboldt Bay)

General comments

Community members requested that the HBHRCD organize a public workshop to address local concerns. The HBHRCD met with Planning Team members to coordinate that effort. They have hired a facilitator to conduct a workshop scheduled for Saturday, November 11th, and the HBHRCD plans to invite a cross section of interested individuals. The role of The Department would be limited to an initial presentation of the MLPA time line and introduction of the lead person for the region. The Department suggested the workshop focus on obtaining specific site alternatives.

Other points discussed included whether there would be a CEQA process, using maps with more geologic relief and types and attributes of habitats and species, using artificial reefs, and scientific data to support specific sites chosen and the effectiveness of MPAs as a resource management tool.

Site-specific comments

The HBHRCD, which was originally opposed to any MPA in Humboldt Bay, would like to work with The Department on some alternative to the original Initial Draft Concept, perhaps something in the mostly undeveloped south bay

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 11, Natural Resources Defense Council, Environmental Defense (NRDC), and other environmental groups (all regions)

General comments

The group expressed enthusiasm for the about the Initial Draft Concepts and the process to solicit public comment. The group suggested improvements to the process, including use of layered GIS maps, small group meetings and facilitated meetings are preferable to public workshops, in-meeting dynamic mapping, posting small-group meetings on the website, and distinguishing subsequent map drafts by using a different font or other visual cue.

The general criticism to the Initial Draft Concept was the size of the protected areas, the distance between them, the amount of deep-water habitat included for the North Central Region and the lack of proposed areas within San Francisco Bay. Many of their comments came directly from "[Analysis and Evaluation of the Draft Marine Protected Area Network For California State Waters Proposed by the California Department of Fish and Game Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan Team, North Central Region](#)" prepared by S. Morgan for NRDC and World Wildlife Fund. Just a few specifics from this detailed report are highlighted here.

Site-specific comments:

Alternative or additional sites include the Sea Ranch area and Bean Hollow State Beach.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 16, Small Boat Commercial Salmon Fisherman's Association (North Central)

General comments only

The Small Boat Commercial Salmon Fishermens' Association (SBCSFA) is a group of approximately 80 members, most of whom are commercial salmon trollers. This meeting was introductory in nature, as many in the group had not yet reviewed the Initial Draft Concept maps. Several members voiced their concern over the ability to anchor in marine reserves. The confusion was based on the fact that anchoring is specifically mentioned in proposed regulations for the Año Nuevo State Marine Reserve. In other words, if anchoring is not to be restricted in marine reserves, why is it specifically described in one?

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 16, Fisherman's Marketing Association of Bodega Bay (Pt. Arena to Duxbury Reef and the Farallon Islands)

General comments

This group represents most of the commercial fishermen out of the Bodega Bay port. They fish primarily fish crab and salmon, none participate in the live-fish fishery and very few fish for groundfish. Their concern is with their ability to fish salmon and crab, which are extremely important to their livelihood. Safety is a big concern, and they feel they shouldn't have to risk a fine for anchoring. If MPAs are not protecting species, but habitat, then reserves should be easily moved not to impact fishing. They questioned whether there is coordination between state and federal MPA efforts.

Site-specific comments

Point Arena SMR:

This would impact current salmon and crab fishing activities. Salmon fishing area is Point Arena to the buoy. Crab fishing is north of Point Arena (Manchester Beach to below cable lines. Point Arena and Del Mar Point: not as much fishing in this area but is important to commercial urchin divers, especially Saunder's Reef area.

Del Mar Point SMR:

Crab and salmon grounds are outside of the reserve. Anything within 10 fathoms is not a problem for FMABB. Wouldn't be opposed to a reserve in the Sea Ranch area.

Salt Point SMR & SMP:

The marine reserve is not a concern, but the marine park is a nuisance because it disrupts salmon trolling in the area.

Fort Ross SMR:

Prime anchoring spot, but doesn't impact fishing.

Sonoma Coast Beach SCMA:

A lot of crab fishing occurs in this area both commercially and recreationally. FMABB is adamant about being able also fish for crab in this conservation area. This is an important area for smaller commercial boats and sport boats. This area is close to port and is an easily accessible and safe area if the weather is bad. This conservation area greatly affects shore fishing for surfperch, rockfish, night smelt and other shore zone species. The proposed conservation area is in a heavily used beach, by the public for recreational activities.

Bodega SMR:

No expansion of reserve past 10 fathoms from Bodega Head to Mussel Point. Creation of Bodega Marine Reserve was originally a gentlemen's agreement with the university; by extending the reserve it impacts salmon and other finfish fishing.

Esteros Americano and de San Antonio SMRs:

Ranchers may have concerns about creating of public access. Why is there a need to protect esteros since nobody goes there, and the bar rarely breaks open to the ocean?

Bird Rock SMR:

Hold to 10 fathoms and it wouldn't impact salmon fishing. Sport anglers heavily use this area and much closer than 10 fathoms. Provides excellent opportunities for people to dive for abalone.

Point Reyes Headlands SMR:

Out to ten fathoms only, and then it wouldn't impact crab fishing. Most of the larger boat from Bodega Bay come down here to fish crab. Shipping lane near headlands is essential a reserve because they can't fish there. An alternative proposed is to add the reserve status to Drakes Estero instead.

Duxbury Reef SMCA:

No problem because it allows salmon fishing.

Farallon Islands SMR/SCMA:

SMR impacts salmon and crab fishing, and halibut trawling. The fishing is much better within one mile than three miles.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 23, Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries (Año Nuevo to Monterey)**General comments**

Some thought that any MPA is unacceptable; a few people left the room with frustration when the talk turned to various options for siting the network.

One individual thought that those folks not using the ocean should not have any role in managing marine resources. Others also thought that the fishers could successfully regulate themselves "to a certain degree".

Some thought that MLPA implementation should be phased in, starting with just those MPAs that are already in place.

The majority in attendance thought that if MPAs are established they should be closed to all users.

Many were concerned about keeping traditional anchorages open for use.

Some thought that there were too many regulations on fishing already. They worried about transponders on boats for tracking purposes. They were concerned that once a few MPAs were established more would follow from both the state and from federal entities.

Some thought that there should be funding in place to monitor and enforce the MPAs before they are established. Some suggested that fishers should monitor the areas for ten years prior to MPA establishment. A need for fish surveys in water depths less than 15 feet was noted. Alternately, some of those same fishers also thought that researchers should not be allowed access to the MPAs if fishers couldn't fish in them.

Several expressed their disbelief in science and blamed their uncertain fishing future on scientists. Some thought biodiversity was a 'buzzword', and several did not believe the groundfish stock assessments or that there is a cause for concern over the current status of groundfish populations.

Some considered fishers to be natural predators in the marine system, similar to marine mammals, fishes etc.

One participant stated that extensive MPA closures in central California could result in an 8-10 million dollar economic loss to the local economy.

Site-specific comments

Año Nuevo SMR:

Although this is generally opposed, the southern half is more important than the northern half due to weather considerations.

Año Nuevo SMCA:

Although this is generally opposed, the southern half is more important than the northern half due to weather considerations. Crab and pelagic species fishing, including squid, should be allowed in the SMCA.

Natural Bridges SMR:

Move this site north, but leave 4 miles north and south of Davenport Landing open because of access.

Natural Bridges SMCA:

Move this site north, but leave 4 miles north and south of Davenport Landing open because of access.

Soquel Canyon SMCA:

Most or all of the commercial fishermen at the table were opposed to making Soquel Canyon an MPA. Their rationale is that they use Soquel Canyon as one of the few areas they can still trawl when the Council restricts their take offshore (as is the case at the end of the year when quotas are met or exceeded). Soquel Canyon is located in state waters of Monterey Bay but outside 3-miles from the beach. They offered Carmel Canyon, Partington Canyon, and the area between 35 degrees, 58 minutes and 36 degrees, 05 minutes (which includes the existing Big Creek Reserve) as replacement MPAs for Soquel Canyon. If the Soquel proposal were to remain, there should be an allowance for spot prawn trapping. Spot prawn commercial fishing with traps occurs within this proposed SMCA and has occurred in the past. The two individuals who either fish there now or have fished there would oppose a restriction on spot prawn trapping here.

Portuguese Ledge SMCA:

Trade Portuguese Ledge SMCA with the rock habitat off the Monterey Peninsula (e.g. Loran 42805)

Point Sur SMCA:

Move Pt. Sur MPA to the north of Pt. Sur

Big Creek SMCA:

They would support expanding Big Creek SMCA to Lopez Pt. and out to 3 miles (as a replacement for eliminating the proposed Soquel Canyon and Portuguese Ledge sites. However, the nearshore live fish fishers want to keep the nearshore areas open from south of Big Creek and out to 60-100' depth.

Conception SMP:

One fisherman stated that the Conception SMP is a good rockfish area and should be closed to 1-mile from shore only. Another fisherman disagreed and said that the other suggested MPAs in the region are more important to him than Conception.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 24, Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries (North Central and North) General comments

Anything outside ten fathoms should be open to crab, salmon and wetfish fishing (i.e., sardine, anchovy, pacific mackerel, squid).

North Central Region:

This meeting was organized primarily by Half Moon Bay members of the Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fishing and the Half Moon Bay Fishermen's Marketing Assn. The ACSF presented a draft of their policy statement in regard to MPAs, however their general opinion was that the process is going forward without the necessary planning, research and funding in place. The Channel Islands reserve process should go forward first before any additional reserves are set up statewide. A detailed list of concerns is outlined in the draft policy statement

North Region:

There was a lot of concern that the fishermen from the North Region would not be represented, and that these closures would devastate an already economically depressed region.

Site-specific comments

Pt. Arena:

Move the northern boundary south to the wash rock, and make it a conservation area (commercial salmon and crab) inside 10 fathoms.

Del Mar Pt. to Salt Pt.:

In general the area would be a good place for a reserve.

Fort Ross:

This area should be moved because of issues regarding public access.

Fort Ross to Bodega:

This area should be at least left open as a conservation area and allow commercial salmon and crab.

Bodega and Bird Rock Reserves:

This group deferred opinion to the Bodega Bay Fishermen's Marketing Assn.

Sonoma Coast SMCA:

Crab fishing should be allowed.

Pt. Reyes Headlands:

Change to a conservation area.

Duxbury Reef:

Allow halibut hook and line, crab, white sea bass and wetfish.

Farallon Islands:

Change the whole area to a conservation area with the reserve boundary at ten fathoms.

Allow crab, halibut and salmon.

Fitzgerald SMR:

The southern boundary should stop at Pillar Pt. and the northern boundary could be extended. The western boundary should stop at $\frac{3}{4}$ of mile instead of one mile to allow protection of the reef, but still provide for crab fishing (There is a ledge at 14 fathoms in that particular spot). This area is too close to the port and could be hazardous to skiff fishermen. Alternatively set aside an area north of this SMR from Egg Rock to Shelter Cove. The habitat there is a combination of rocky reef, kelp forest, shale reef and the fishermen believe there is more diversity to be found here than at Fitzgerald. Inside ten fathoms could be a reserve area and outside could be a conservation area allowing salmon and wetfish fishing.

Año Nuevo:

80% of the squid landed comes out of this area. If the northern boundary was changed to 37°6 instead of the currently proposed 37°8, and the offshore boundary changed to the ten-fathom line, it would still allow protection for the kelp forest while providing an edge to fish. Crab, squid, rock and Dungeness crab, and wetfish should be allowed.

Saint George Reef SMR:

Change to a conservation area to allow crab fishing.

Castle Rock SMCA, Lost Coast SMR, Shelter Cove SMCA, Point Cabrillo SMR, Russian Gulch SMP, Mendocino SMCA, and Van Damme SMP:

Delete these initial draft concepts

Reading Rock SMP: Change to a conservation area to allow crab fishing.

Patrick's Pt. SMR and Trinidad SMCA:

Change entire area to a conservation area to allow for salmon and crab fishing.

Eel SMR:

Delete and leave existing restrictions/protection.

Kings Reserve:

Delete and leave existing reserve.

Sinkyone SMP, DeHaven SMP, MacKerricher SMR, and Green wood SMP:

Ok as is.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 25, Santa Barbara County Fish and Game Commission (general discussion)

General comments only

Discussion focused on timeline and process as well as concerns over the scope of proposed areas.

A specific concern was raised regarding the lack of use of other types of management measures than MPAs.

The commission expressed interest in staying closely involved with this and other MPA processes.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 26, Mayor Rodger Anderson, Morro Bay (general discussion)

General comments only

Mayor Anderson had some general concerns that some well-intentioned people are going to make decisions that affect peoples' lives. He focused on the fishery management implications of the MLPA and stated that there are more familiar and traditional ways to eliminate or reduce take than MPAs.

The scope of the Initial Draft Concepts is the primary issue. He would prefer small demonstration areas in which proof would be demonstrated that populations outside as well as inside MPAs are enhanced. He asked if there were minimum requirements for size and number of MPAs.

Fishermen would rather see all restrictive access fisheries and quotas rather than more MPAs. The fear is that if MPA closures do not contribute to improve fisheries they will still remain in place forever. The concept of permanent closures is not in favor with local fishermen.

There is an overlying concern that the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary staff wants to turn the entire area into a no-fishing zone.

In reference to the proposed elimination of the four existing Pismo clam reserves due to their ineffectiveness, he stated that the fishermen believe this is really a token gesture and will not appease anyone regarding the option of deleting MPAs from the system.

He feels that if it comes down to votes that the fishermen will be outnumbered as they are in the general public. He did agree that 3-5% for a percentage of state waters within MPAs might be palatable.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 26, Kelp harvesters (joint meeting with South Region) (entire state)

General comments

They felt that sub-regional workshops were appropriate due to differences in use and interest within a region.

They stated that it would be of great benefit to this group and for the simplification of definitions if the MLPA planning Team included a blanket allowance for kelp harvesting within any SMCA.

Kelp harvesting regulations are now under a 5-year CEQA review- we should not counteract that. In addition, some of the five-year leases are actually part of a 20-year cycle. December 31, 2000 was the end of a 5-year term, and the next 5 years is the end of a 20-year term. We need to be aware of all leased and closed kelp beds in designing proposed MPAs.

At present, the following kelp beds are now closed to harvest:

Northern Calif: 301 to 307, 310, 311

Central Calif: 203, 206, 224, 225, 226

Southern Calif: 10 (Abalone Point to corona Del Mar), 15 (Santa Monica to Malibu), 33 (Santa Barbara near harbor), 24 (Santa Barbara near harbor)

No island beds are closed.

Winter harvest of kelp is of primary concern due to safety issues. Key beds need to remain open to sustain their operations.

Artificial feed will not be able to replace kelp for feeding cultured abalone due to cost. It also has pollution associated with its use.

They asked what we would recommend if an aquaculture operation wanted to become established within an existing MPA? We stated that it would be best NOT to recommend MPA status for an area in which aquaculture operations exist. At present this primarily applies to estuarine areas.

Site-specific comments

Natural Bridges SMR:

They would like to see this proposed site moved to the north (away from the harbor). Perhaps the proposed northern boundary at Table Rock could become the southern boundary. If the Reserve can not be moved to the north then change to SMCA designation and allow for kelp harvesting.

Natural Bridges SMCA:

This proposed site would be a major impact to U.S. Abalone if kelp harvesting was not allowed. There is a nice bed to the east near the Santa Cruz pier which they never harvest due to surfing use (a type of ad hoc refuge). They harvest in the Soquel Point area from winter to July then move north from Santa Cruz Point to the north.

Recommendation: Allow kelp harvest in SMCA or re-locate SMCA to the north. Note: an important area for them is from Pt. Año Nuevo south to Waddell Creek, including Scott Creek area. They conduct a major harvest of bull kelp on the beach. They were interested in knowing if this would be impacted by a reserve. They would prefer that this proposed site be moved to the north (away from the harbor). Perhaps the proposed northern boundary at Table Rock could become the southern boundary. If the SMCA can not be moved to the north then allow for kelp harvesting.

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

They have already discussed this issue and came up with a solution in the Fish and Game

Commission forum. Their solution allows an experimental kelp harvesting area to remain in between two protected areas. Recommendation: call it an SMCA but keep the existing kelp harvest regulations.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

No opposition since as proposed it would allow kelp harvesting. However, they are concerned with Tidepool Coalition's desire to prohibit kelp harvest in area.

Carmel Bay SMCA:

(see **ISP** comments above).

Point Sur SMCA:

(see **ISP** comments above).

Salmon Creek SMR:

(see **ISP** comments above).

Piedras Blancas SMCA:

No opposition

Cambria SMR:

(see **ISP** comments above). In addition, this is of major concern to the Ab Farm. They recommend moving this proposed SMR to the other side of the Cambria SMCA (to the north), from Pico Rock to San Simeon. There is good kelp habitat there and it is too dangerous for the kelp cutter boats. As an alternative, change the designation to SMCA and allow kelp harvesting.

Cambria SMCA:

(see **ISP** comments above). In addition, abalone aquaculture interests use the inner beds. This is a major concern for the Ab Farm.

Conception SMP:

Safety Zone 4, from Point Arguello to the mouth of the Santa Ynez River, is a no-stop area for vessels so it is a de facto reserve. A recommendation was to extend this north to Rocky Point and delete the proposed Purisima SMCA.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 29, Commercial Small Skiff Fishermen (Pt. Sur to Pt. Buchon)

General comments

They stated that the central California commercial small skiff fishermen (there are eight of them) do not support any additional MPAs. They move around and fish a large area of the coast, spreading out effort so as not to cause local impacts. They may visit a particular spot no more than three times within a year.

Access for launching their skiffs is a critical concern. They are only concerned with the area within 1 mile of shore.

They stated that they have found no edge effect from fishing along the boundary of Big Creek Reserve.

They agreed to work with John Smiley, Big Creek Ecological Reserve Manager, and present to us a prioritized list of the kelp beds relative to their importance to them for maintaining a sustainable fishery.

In the Morro Bay area there are differences of opinion between the small skiffs and larger commercial nearshore boats. They said there could not be adequate representation by one individual for both groups.

Site-specific comments

Point Sur SMCA:

They could live with this one as it is at least 20 miles from the nearest skiff launch area.

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SMR:

They strongly oppose this due to economic reasons.

Big Creek SMR:

Support as is.

Big Creek SMCA:

Support as is, although one skiff fishermen not at the meeting may oppose the SMCA proposal because he uses the offshore area.

In general a very important area to both the skiff fishermen and the Big Creek Reserve manager is the Santa Lucia kelp bed from Rat Creek to Dolan Creek. The Big Creek Reserve manager and skiff fishers have had a controlled fishing experiment here for many years and wish to retain that. Most skiff fishers do not go farther north than Partington. The area from Lopez Point to Cape San Martin is completely utilized by them and they would oppose MPAs here. One exception would be a 1-mile stretch from Lime Creek to Dolan Creek.

Salmon Creek SMR:

Oppose this but they could partition the area into degrees of use and possibly come up with some small acceptable areas for an MPA. In general the area south of Cape San Martin is used more by the bigger vessels and less by them. In winter the only launch sites are at Piedras Blancas and Leffingwell

Piedras Blancas SMCA:

Oppose this strongly but offered a modified version which would leave the area south of the lighthouse open.

Cambria SMR:

Strongly opposed due to its economic importance and location of launch site. As an alternative they proposed an area open to recreational fishing but closed to commercial fishing from just north of San Simeon Point to Pico Creek. There are good rockfish populations here but not so many cabezon, which is what they target.

Cambria SMCA:

Strongly oppose due to its economic importance and location of launch site

Point Buchon SMCA:

Not opposed.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Oct 30, Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries (Monterey Bay to Pt. Sur)

General comments

They believe it is best for constituents to give lots of input so these important decisions will not be made entirely by Agency staff.

There was some support expressed for legislation which would terminate the MLPA process. In general there was uniform opposition to adding more MPAs to the existing array. They believe that there is no flexibility in the MLPA process.

They stated that in 37 of 41 newly proposed MPAs (referring to statewide) recreational fishing for benthic fishes is prohibited.

They believe that environmental groups should consider relief packages or subsidies for displaced fishermen.

They stated that concentrating fishing effort is counterproductive to sustaining fisheries. We should give existing new regulations a chance to work. Some of these new regulations are promoting wastage of fish.

They asked how MPAs will be implemented and enforced without funding.

They stated that more resources should be directed towards stock assessments rather than new MPAs.

Decisions should not be made on siting MPAs within state waters until we know what federal MPAs are going to be established.

They believe that the MLPA team has chosen the best fishing spots for MPAs are negative impacts on users will be severe.

They felt that phasing in over a long time period should be considered for additional MPAs.. Test some existing ones first- we are not in a (fishery management) crisis mode.

The salmon fishery is critical to central California commercial fishermen, given the extensive restrictions to the north. Salmon fishing should be allowed in as many areas as possible. The SMCA designation should be used to accommodate this concern.

Site-specific comments

Año Nuevo SMCA:

Commercial and recreational crab fishing should be added to the allowable uses.

Soquel Canyon SMCA:

This is a very important area to the CPFV fishery, commercial hook-and-line fishery, and the trawl fishery (who fish on the shelf surrounding the steep slopes of the canyon for flatfish). As an alternative they offered that area of Monterey Canyon directly off Moss Landing and within 3 miles of shore. However, they would consider a reduction in the

proposed Soquel area if a line of latitude was drawn to bisect it and the southern half was left open.

Portuguese Ledge SMCA:

They suggested this might be acceptable if a 1-mile wide section in the western half was shaved off, i.e. move the western boundary in by 1 mile, or just use the rocky area within the original proposed area and develop a smaller SMCA.

Point Lobos SMCA:

This was opposed by everyone, including the trawlers, because it impacts the only area in which they are legally allowed to trawl between 1 and 3 miles from shore. As an alternative, it was suggested that we move this site to the south off of Granite Canyon, from Soberanes Point south to Garrapata Beach, extend it out to 1 mile only, and allow squid fishing.

However, this alternative would impact the nearshore fishery.

Point Sur SMCA:

This was generally opposed. As an alternative, change the proposed southern boundary to a proposed northern boundary and extend it south to off Cooper Point, or establish a SMCA in the Partington area and allow spot prawn trapping.

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SMR:

Opposed by spot prawn trap fishermen. However, they could live with a prohibition on spot prawn trapping in the southern half to southern three quarters of the proposed SMR.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 1, Monterey County Fish and Game Commission (general discussion)

General comments only

The Commission's primary concern was that people are not being made aware of what has happened since the July workshops, particularly those who do not have internet access.

Some bad press has made many people afraid that the scope of the Initial Draft Concept will destroy all of their fishing opportunities.

The Commission has concerns about how we plan to enforce any new MPAs, and they asked how we can propose new MPAs without adequate or accurate information.

The Commission would like to remain a part of the MLPA process.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 7, North Coast Sea Urchin Divers (North and North Central)

General comments

A lot of areas are essentially protected by weather. The increase in marine protected areas will increase fishing pressure on the open areas. The resource is in recovery, and that there are fewer urchin divers every year. Size limits, day closures, lottery for new

licenses regulate the fishery already, not to mention that there are only 60-90 work day a year (due to weather). The proposed closure effectively close most of their prime fishing areas. There needs to be a standard for defining the boundaries of closed areas, i.e., use latitude and longitude coordinates.

A table calculating the area and habitat of the existing reserves along the Mendocino and Sonoma Coasts Was submitted. From this it was concluded that the reduction in Sea Urchin diving area by the proposed MPAs planned for central/southern Mendocino Coast affecting the ports of Fort Bragg, Albion, and Point Arena would be 16%. The belief is that this easily means a 32% loss of production, quite possibly even more.

Site-specific comments, North Region

Kings Range SMR:

Less important than other areas proposed. An alternative to this area would be the Cape Mendocino area; untouched urchins due to poor quality, and a huge reef of rocky pinnacles.

Lost Coast SMR:

Major fishing area for salmon and crab.

DeHaven SMP:

This is a prime urchin diving area that extends out into workable salmon fishing grounds.

MacKerricher SMR:

There is some confusion over the boundary for this proposed area. Is ten-mile beach included in this area? This is a prime urchin/crab fishing area, which is close to port.

Point Cabrillo SMR:

Expands the existing reserve to include Caspar Pt., doubles the amount of closed area, and restricts access close to Fort Bragg.

Russian Gulch SMR:

Prime urchin fishing grounds. Protected from NW winds and also protected by SW winds by the Mendocino headlands. Prime urchin recovery area (heavy recruitment to fishery).

Van Damme SMP:

Prime urchin fishing grounds. Protected from NW winds. The SW boundary line of the proposed area bisects a workable area (they are likely to work the edge). Closes a lot of the safe harbor working area.

Greenwood SMP:

Prime urchin fishing grounds. Protected from NW winds.

Pt. Arena SMR: Prime working area close up against the rock.

Site-specific comments, North Central Region

Del Mar Point SMR:

The southern boundary could be moved to ½ mile north of Blacks Pt as a potential compromise for relaxing other boundaries that are more important.

Salt Pt. SMR and SMP:

There is an existing urchin fishery closure in this area in which urchins are very abundant. North of Salt Pt to Stump Beach (including Fisk Mill Cove) is a very important area for urchin fishing and should be left open.

Fort Ross SMR:

This area is important for both the urchin fishery and the sport abalone divers. A small closure is ok, but this is an important public access point.

Sonoma Coast SMCA:

The urchin fishery works north of Mussel Pt. and around the corner.

Bodega Bay SMR:

This area (about 1000+ feet offshore) is often the only workable area in January and February. A closure for the rest of the year would be fine.

Bird Rock SMR:

From Bird Rock to Elephant Rock are some of the primary historical fishing grounds for the urchin fishery, however they are willing to negotiate this area for some at Salt Pt.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 7, National Park Service (False Klamath Cove and North Sea Cave Cove Areas, Del Norte County)

General and Site-specific comments combined

Representatives of the Redwood National and State Park (RNSP) were interested in describing areas of biological significance along the 33 mile shoreline of the Park, and recommended the following areas as alternatives for SMRs:

False Klamath Cove (4 miles north of the Klamath River): This cove is bordered by Highway 101 and features approximately 0.5 mile of black sand beach with Wilson Creek crossing the beach on the north end of the cove. False Klamath Rock is the largest and most prominent feature offshore and is the fourth largest breeding site for common murrelets in northern California. This rock is also utilized as a breeding site for several other birds including Brandt's, double-crested, and pelagic cormorants, and the pigeon guillemot. Brown pelicans also use the rock on a seasonal basis.

North Sea Cave Cove (approximately 2 miles north of the Klamath River estuary): Three large flat offshore rocks are within the cove area and are used by the federally threatened Stellar's sea lion as a haul out site seasonally (April-July).

RNSP recommends that the offshore rocks in these coves be included in the proposed MPA and that vessel traffic (except under emergency response) be prohibited within 100m of these rocks. We discussed that the MLPA did not address the restriction of vessel traffic and that this type of restriction was not in the Initial Draft Concept. The question was raised on whether the MLPA included above water habitat, such as offshore rocks. There was also the suggestion that these reserves be made larger and not spaced so far apart, so as to include more habitats. It was stressed that rookeries and haul out sites are part of the marine ecosystem and that these sites should be included to make reserves more

complete biologically. It was noted that the federally threatened/state endangered marbled murrelet forages nearshore along the park's coastline during the nesting season.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 8, Humboldt State University (Humboldt Bay)

General comments

The Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation and Conservation District (HBHRCD) has just started work on a new Humboldt Bay Resource Management Plan which will review the marine resources of the bay and estuary and develop management recommendations. This process can be used to determine where an MPA should be placed in the bay.

Several researchers expressed their interest:

A scientist with primary interest in intertidal invertebrates would support reserve status (no take) for areas with unique biological properties and conservation status for other parts to the bay. The scientist would like to see current regulations for recreational take of gaper and Washington clams (25 of each species /person/day) in Humboldt Bay be changed to be in line with the rest of the state (10 of each species /person/day). The scientist believes these species cannot withstand the fishing pressure that they are now experiencing.

A second scientist would like to see an MPA covering most of the South Bay section of Humboldt Bay and he approved of the placement of the majority of MPA sites in the Initial Draft Concept for the North region. The scientist questioned whether MPA status for Humboldt Bay would require mitigation of current or ongoing activities in the bay (e.g. aquaculture).

A third scientist also approved of the placement of North region MPA sites in the Initial Draft Concept, especially SMR status for Point St. George (most representative of productive offshore reef) and Patricks Point (proximity to HSU marine lab and State Park, accessible for research, and productive habitat). The scientist offered to "go to bat" for these reserves and stressed a belief that no take reserves are needed along the north coast. The need to have MPAs in areas that are easily accessible was discussed, and that MPA placement in out of the way (but politically acceptable) spots, such as Punta Gorda, was not a good idea. The question was raised on how the Dept. plans to monitor MPAs for their effectiveness.

A fourth scientist stated a Pt. Saint George MPA could be easily monitored in good weather from the Pt. St George Lighthouse. The scientist suggested moving the proposed Eel River MPA inland, away from productive Dungeness crab fishing area, to encompass sections of the Eel River estuary. This area is important for a wide variety of marine-related plants and animals and is also adjacent a Department wildlife refuge.

A fifth Scientist was supportive of the MLPA and feels that this is a good opportunity, rarely seen, for resource management. The scientist did, however, question whether the

emphasis of the act is solely on fisheries management, for instance in choosing MPA sites are we considering feeding areas of coastal marine birds. Castle Rock near Crescent City is the 2nd largest seabird colony in California. Also, the endangered marbled murrelet nests in old growth redwoods of Redwood National and State Park, and forages in adjacent nearshore waters while caring for nestlings. The scientist also supported any designation for Humboldt Bay (including the Ramsar classification) which brought attention to the bay's importance to wildlife.

A sixth scientist put together a project for his students that will employ mathematical modeling to examine the effects of area closures on nearshore rockfish fishery.

Site-specific comments

Humboldt Bay:

The South Bay section of the bay was discussed as a logical area for MPA placement. This part of the bay is the least impacted by human activities and a portion would be included in the Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Area. Industrial activity in the South Bay is concentrated on the north east shoreline at Fields Landing.

There are three competing interests in this area that would effect further industrial development and MPA boundaries of any proposal for South Bay: 1) Proponents for restricting further development and expand habitat protection in the South Bay. To support this option people cite the area's vast and robust eelgrass beds, their importance to a wide range of wildlife, the mostly undeveloped shoreline, and the proximity of Fish and Wildlife Service's Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge. 2) Proponents for developing a major shipping port at Fields Landing. The HBHRCD, City of Eureka, and Humboldt County support the expansion of port facilities in Humboldt Bay. The HBHRCD owns property in Fields Landing, which if developed into a landing facility, would generate revenue for the District. Port development in this area depends on deepening Hookton Channel along Fields Landing and just beyond the turning basin to the south. 3) Proponents for creating a tourist attraction out of a retired US Naval vessel. A local historical society has proposed mooring an approximately 500 ft. Vietnam War era vessel at Fields Landing as a showcase for a U.S. Naval museum. This development would also depend on deepening Hookton Channel along Fields Landing and just beyond the turning basin to the south.

Although an EIR has apparently been completed for the dredging project, the Army Corps of Engineers (COE) has yet to obtain funding for this work. Also, there appears to be opposition from several sectors to both development projects. Because the final disposition of this area will not be decided for years to come, and that it has previously been dredged by the COE, it appears that this section of the South Bay should not be considered at this time as an MPA alternative. However, there is support for the area to the south of the proposed projects.

The suggestion was made that the Dept. needs to define what habitat or species it is trying to protect when proposing an area for MPA status. They would also like to see The

Department encourage more field research in Humboldt Bay, especially in conjunction with HSU.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 13, San Diego Council of Divers (general discussion and South Region)

General comments

A question was raised regarding any intention to protect pinnipeds with the extension of La Jolla.

It was noted that changes need to be as detailed as possible on the Internet.

A request was made that The Department look at eutrophication impacts to fish and larvae at La Jolla as well as point source and non point source pollution: studies at Point Loma indicate no negative outfall; disturbance to habitat is a concern for The Department.

The amount of staff to complete MLPA was questioned; 12 Department staff (most at 50% time) and a Scientific Panel work on MPAs.

One person noted that concern to protect and offer rest to oceans is about 20 years to late, they asked if The Department is bowing to the pressures of commercial fishermen. It was noted that in many cases the loudest voice against MPAs is recreational fishermen, the Department's task is to balance concerns of all constituents.

There was a concern that habitat selected is less prime habitat.

Do legalities of kelp leases at Point Loma moot alternatives at Point Loma? Not necessarily, but The Department is required to consider existing leases.

There was concern about the trap fishery and its overall impacts.

MLPA is un-funded bill; NOAA grant of \$320K pending to The Department to finish project; earlier grant money went to initial set of meetings, one graduate student and one public relations person, as well as expenses of the science team.

A request was made regarding the amount of monies NGOs have contributed to the MLPA process. It was noted that previous funding came from a grant from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the source of that grant was not discussed.

It was asked if the intent is to create Yosemite in the sea? The Department responded that while undisturbed habitats for intrinsic value was one goal there were also a variety of other goals.

What about reserves at Pendleton? Marines said no; Department of Defense has concerns about reserves at Vandenberg, San Clemente and other areas near military installations. A general concern was expressed regarding interaction with Military and creation of MPAs. It was noted that the Dept. of Defense was submitting a specific proposal for areas to include and exclude.

How much real-time underwater surveying is going on? Point Loma is well surveyed and other areas are currently being recorded.

Are only study sites being considered for MPAs? No, a variety of factors, including those discussed in the presentation are being considered.

Is there a Federal Act going into effect that will negate all State MPAs? State has authority to manage all waters within three miles of land.

What about lagoons along coast? The Department will be considering coastal lagoons and estuaries in the next draft. Comments regarding specific lagoons are welcomed.

Site-specific comments

Point Loma :

A variety of alternatives were discussed including moving the reserve closer to Mission Bay, having less protection offshore (i.e. a reserve close to shore and conservation area offshore) and eliminating reserves in this area. No consensus view was expressed.

La Jolla:

Two alternatives were discussed. These included a slight expansion of the existing MPA to extend no farther north than the Scripps Pier, and a second expansion south to the Children's Cove. The second alternative had very little support, though the first was generally acceptable.

Carlsbad Lagoons:

A potential alternative for a State Marine Park in this area was discussed. Some concern was raised for commercial lobster fishing in the area, but in general these parks were acceptable.

Pendleton:

Concerns were expressed that the Pendleton area was not being considered solely due to Military issues. It was noted that many public comments also opposed this site and the Military issue was not the only concern.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 13, Morro Bay- Port San Luis area Commercial Nearshore Fishery (Pt. Sur to Pt. Conception)

General comments

They do not support any additional MPAs. They consider the phrase in MLPA “to improve the array of MPAs” to mean only use the existing MPAs, work with them, evaluate them, and possibly expand some of them.

They were also concerned that fishing effort outside of MPAs would have to be reduced in proportion to the area set aside for MPAs, through additional regulations, as suggested in the draft Nearshore Fishery Management Plan.

They think pinniped predation on any enhanced fish populations within MPAs would counteract the presumed benefits to fishing from MPAs. They believe the Department should take some initiative regarding the management of pinnipeds, primarily California sea lions and harbor seals.

They want proof that MPAs will help sustain or improve fisheries and do not see any science that shows this.

They felt that the process has not allowed them to provide significant input on the need for MPAs and on the Initial Draft Concepts. They asked how we planned to develop a recommendation that does not put them out of business.

They would like to see the comments from these group discussions put on our Web site.

They felt that if new MPAs had to be implemented, they would prefer that they would be small and that commercial and recreational fishing are treated the same.

They opposed any SMCA designation that would allow recreational finfishing for certain species but prohibit commercial fishing for those same species. They do not think this process should be used to pit one user group against another.

They felt that within any SMR, all uses other than scientific research or collecting should be prohibited. This would include non-extractive scuba diving.

They would prefer that if any additional MPAs had to be implemented that they are far from ports.

They did not feel that these meetings should be conducted with an assumption that we would just trade alternate sites on a mile by mile basis, but that many proposed sites are too big to start with.

Regarding representation at facilitated group discussions, they felt that two or three individuals could represent commercial fishing interests in the Morro Bay-Port San Luis region.

They made a strong statement that our Revised Draft Concept should explain that there is a process in place to modify and delete MPAs if necessary.

They questioned how we can possibly have effective management and enforcement for any new MPAs if this mandate remains unfunded.

Site-specific comments

Salmon Creek SMR:

They oppose this site because of its importance to the CPFV and live fish fisheries and did not suggest an alternate.

Piedras Blancas SMCA:

They strongly oppose this site due to its importance to CPFVs, and the nearshore fishery, particularly for kayaks and small boats.

Cambria SMR:

They strongly oppose this. We discussed the alternative of an SMR between Pico Rock and San Simeon but they felt that the initial proposal for the Cambria SMR was the lesser of two evils (e.g. they support neither)

Cambria SMCA:

They strongly oppose the SMCA designation as it favors recreational fishing but it is very important to their fishery

Point Buchon SMCA:

We discussed the recent closure around Diablo Canyon (1-mile radius) as an alternative, and although they did not feel that this closure is permanent, it is a possibility for an alternative. The Team emphasized that there is a 25-year data base of marine resources in this area.

Purisima Point SMCA:

(See comments below for Conception SMP)

Conception SMP:

They focused on the Zone 4 military closure, from the mouth of the Santa Ynez River south to Pt. Arguello, (7.5 miles of shoreline and out to 3 miles) and suggested this as an alternative to BOTH the Conception SMP and Purisima SMCA. Although there is a significant amount of soft bottom, there is some good rocky habitat inside of 10 fathoms in the southern portion of Zone 4. They were concerned about impacts to the halibut, white seabass, rock crab, and lobster fisheries from the proposed Conception SMP. They felt that there was some brown rockfish habitat in Zone 4.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 13, Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries (Morro Bay to Pt. Conception)

General comments

They do not support any additional MPAs.

They think pinniped predation on any enhanced fish populations within MPAs would counteract the presumed benefits to fishing from MPAs. They believe the Department should take some initiative regarding the management of pinnipeds, primarily California sea lions and harbor seals. They do not accept the answer that it is “out of our hands”.

They want proof that MPAs will help sustain or improve fisheries and do not see any science that shows this. They asked why this information has not been made available.

They wanted to know what the bottom line is, meaning what is the minimum number, size, and spacing of MPAs that we will accept. Team members explained that there is no hard and fast rule about what constitutes a network, and that the above three parameters are subject to interpretation. They would like to see a definition of a network in our next draft.

They stated that we need to be more specific about goals and objectives at each proposed site.

They are concerned with a reduction in effort that might occur if a significant number of new MPAs are implemented (in reference to the nearshore fishery management plan options).

They asked how many wardens would be needed to effectively enforce any new MPAs.

They felt that, since we were able to get a 16-month extension, we should be able to ask for a 5 to 10-year extension in order to better evaluate the MPAs that we already have.

They felt that water quality protection needs to be integrated into the process.

They felt that if new MPAs had to be implemented, they would prefer that they would be small and that commercial and recreational fishing are treated the same.

They opposed any SMCA designation that would allow recreational finfishing for certain species but prohibit commercial fishing for those same species. They do not think this process should be used to pit one user group against another.

Regarding representation at facilitated group discussions, they felt that we should have much larger groups at these members. One person cited meetings he attended with up to 50 people at a table which, because of proper and professional facilitation, were effective.

They felt that April would be the best month for public meetings, since many of them are not fishing then.

They felt that within the SMCA designation, halibut and rock crab should be added to salmon and pelagic species as allowable fisheries.

Site-specific comments

Point Sur SMCA:

They opposed the this designation because it would impact the nearshore fishermen too much.

Salmon Creek SMR:

They oppose this site because of its importance to the CPFV and livefish fisheries and did not suggest an alternate. They said that the area around White Rock No. 1 is an important anchorage. They asked what we would do if a fiber optic cable was going to be placed in a certain area, would we not consider that for an MPA.

Piedras Blancas SMCA:

They strongly oppose this site due to its importance to CPFVs and the nearshore fishery, particularly for kayaks and small boats. They felt that the huge elephant seal population in this general area was not impacting nearshore fish populations.

Cambria SMR:

They strongly oppose this. We discussed the alternative of an SMR between Pico Rock and San Simeon but they felt that the initial proposal for the Cambria SMR was the lesser of two evils (e.g. they support neither). However, they felt that there might be some support for one SMR in this area if we would drop the two SMCA proposals.

Cambria SMCA:

They strongly oppose the SMCA designation as it favors recreational fishing but it is very important to their fishery. However, they felt that there might be some support for one SMR in this area if we would drop the two SMCA proposals.

Point Buchon SMCA:

Similar to the comments from the commercial nearshore group, we discussed the recent closure around Diablo Canyon (1-mile radius) as an alternative, and although they did not feel that this closure is permanent, it is a possibility for an alternative.

Purisima Point SMCA:

(See comments below for Conception SMP)

Conception SMP:

Similar to the comments from the commercial nearshore fishery, they focused on the Zone 4 military closure, from the mouth of the Santa Ynez River south to Pt. Arguello, (7.5 miles of shoreline and out to 3 miles) and suggested this as an alternative to both the Conception SMP and Purisima SMCA. Although there is a significant amount of soft bottom, there is some good rocky habitat inside of 10 fathoms in the southern portion of Zone 4. They were concerned about impacts to the halibut, white seabass, rock crab, and lobster fisheries from the proposed Conception SMP. There is also an anchorage area near the boathouse. They felt that there was some brown rockfish habitat in Zone 4.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 14, American Oceans Campaign (South Region)

General comments

The proposal should include areas that recognize/utilize estuary restoration.

Coordinating state, federal and international law (jurisdiction). The federal and international jurisdiction issue is unresolved.

There was a general concern that the Department was eliminating areas and not expanding the network. A question was raised regarding why the Department is not targeting a 30 to 60% range?

A serious concern over the safety of public meetings was raised. Representatives from the Angeles Chapter of the Sierra Club warned members of potential intimidation or safety concerns at Southern California Meetings.

The question was asked of how to coordinate efforts to improve estuarine and marine water quality (intra-state jurisdiction). The Department does not have the authority to regulate land use (water quality) and the coordination of "water quality zones" with MPAs will have to be directed at other State regulatory bodies. This coordination is occurring through the inclusion of State Water Resources Control Board in MLPA planning team.

It was noted that we also need to deal with pollution and destructive fishing gear (both in and out of MPAs)

One participant raised the concern over anchoring and other accessibility concerns for users (primarily focused on Farnsworth, but applicable elsewhere).

Education and public outreach both during and post process was a concern.

There was a concern over how to maximize the "network" benefits. Large gaps along the coastline can be addressed by specific recommendations.

Monitoring and enforcement was also a concern.

Major concerns were voiced over the cooperation of the U.S. Military in the planning process. Department staff noted that the Department of Defense has been very cooperative, but does have some concerns over MPAs in specific areas (e.g. Camp Pendleton).

It was noted that the California Chumash Tribe is interested in creating a Marine Managed Area in the vicinity of the Santa Barbara Channel. It was suggested that the Department be sure to include this unique community in its decision making process.

It was noted that significant buy in on any MPA plan could be achieved by including fishing groups (recreational and commercial) and environmental groups in the monitoring, research, and enforcement process. Funds could be raised from nonprofit groups to support such a program. This would balance short term losses and allow the public to accept a larger total set aside.

Site-specific comments

Leo Carrillo

Expand south around the point to include more representative habitat.

Maybe limit the northern boundary (but only if necessary).
Difficulty with squaring off the boundaries with lat & long because the lines would either include area beyond three miles or be significantly smaller.

Santa Monica Bay

This area is just a continuation of existing regulations (note: the area is defined by a straight line from Malibu Pt. to Palos Verdes Point).
There was some discussion of the efficacy of this large area. Pollution and allowable fishing (both recreational and limited commercial) have severely limited the success of current regulations.
Inclusion of this area in the Master Plan somewhat misrepresents the overall region-wide coverage being considered (because of the limited efficacy). This very large area makes it seem like the plan is adding a significant area that has not changed.

Lunada Bay

Included for intertidal protection only.
This area (if expanded some) may also encompass kelp restoration and historical monitoring records (e.g., kelp growth and fish counts).

Abalone Cove

The Department has included this site because it's existing (not because they feel it's been especially productive).
Does not add to larval spillover.
Offers some historical monitoring record.

Pt Fermin

Considering moving the southern boundary away from southern jetty to allow some recreational fishing opportunity.
Could also split the beach portion to allow some take of grunion.
Could enlarge the reserve by moving boundary offshore and possibly north. This may not have a large negative response and is good habitat.
It was noted that most fishing occurs farther off Long Beach at "horseshoe kelp".

Gap Area (between Pt Fermin and Crystal Cove)

Discussion focused on prioritizing areas adjacent to estuary restoration sites.

Crystal Cove/Laguna/Dana Point

Discussed revising the "bookend" reserves around the intertidal SMCA.
Change to larger SMR at south end, SMCA just north, and SMP north of that.
Possibly expand all three of these MPAs to deeper water.

Pendleton

May be off the table because of concerns from the military about possible conflicts with their uses.

Deleting this area from the map: 1) offers opportunities to include areas adjacent to estuary restoration south of Pendleton, 2) mitigates conflicts with sport boats, 3) may offer alternatives that capture better habitat. It was noted after the meeting that if there is less fishing south of this area, the habitat might not be better. The distance from ports, however, explains some of this.

Catalina Island

The Catalina proposals were briefly discussed, including potential additions on the backside.

The issue about diving and anchoring at Farnsworth Bank was raised, and it was noted that existing anchoring has not had a large impact on coral. Inaccessible areas that are naturally protected surround very limited diving area.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 16, Pacific Abalone (Monterey area)

General comments

In 1998, their company, along with other local abalone growers voluntarily established a Monterey Kelp Cooperative (MKC) which addresses user conflicts in this area regarding the harvest of kelp. This group is currently comprised of four harvester members including Monterey Abalone Company, Pacific Abalone Farms, Grillo Enterprises, and US Abalone. The primary purpose of the MKC is to ensure the health of the kelp resource.

Site-specific comments

Hopkins (Ed Ricketts) SMR:

They support the proposed boundaries and regulations for the Hopkins State Marine Reserve, as long as kelp harvesting is permitted within the reserve. They support the kelp no-harvest area recently established by Fish and Game regulations between the Coast Guard Breakwater and the Chart House Restaurant. This no-harvest area will serve as a control area (along with Hopkins Marine Life Refuge) to measure the impacts of harvesting in adjacent areas. This is consistent with the stated objective of the Marine Life Protection Act to set aside areas where differences between Marine Protected Areas and harvest areas can be observed and scientifically studied.

Pacific Grove SMCA:

They are supportive of the proposed boundaries and regulations for the Pacific Grove State Marine Conservation Area, as long as kelp harvesting is permitted within the area. The proposed regulations do include the exception to allow kelp harvesting.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 20, National Park Service (North Central)

General comments

The National Park Service (NPS) is in the process of developing a regional strategy for California, and is looking forward to working more cooperatively with the Department in the future in regard to resource management and conservation. While there is no definite timeline for the NPS in developing their strategy, they will try to have a list of prioritized sites and alternatives prepared for the Department and the MLPA process by February. Sarah Allen has authored a paper on the criteria for the rapid selection versus more strategic planning of marine reserves and will provide a copy of it.

They liked the idea of several small/medium-sized reserves, spaced not terrifically far apart.

The National Park Service has Wilderness Areas that include marine waters. According to the Wilderness Act, the goal of these areas is to preserve the “essence” of the environment, which would include forbidding any mechanized equipment. This restriction has not been enforced thus far in any of the Wilderness Areas in the North Central Region (Pt. Reyes to Bolinas and out ¼ mile), however it is worth noting that this jurisdiction exists.

Some of the questions discussed at this meeting were:

How far do the marine reserve boundaries extend offshore?

What is a meaningful buffer zone for a reserve, and can this be implemented as a conservation area?

What can be reasonably enforced? The National Park Service is committed to enforcement (at least as much as possible in the Point Reyes area) with their available boats and officers.

What percentage of the North Central region will be set aside?

What are the specific criteria for each site?

Site-specific comments

Double Point should be included in a reserve site.

Pt. Reyes Headlands SMR:

The north/south boundaries are more important to include in protection. Changes to the offshore boundary may be more negotiable (1 mile vs. ½ mile).

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 27, Humboldt Bay Aquaculture and Commercial Fishing Industries

General comments

Questions raised included:

How will the North Bay would benefit from being labeled as a MPA?

How will dredging and Bay facility maintenance be affected by MPA's?

Are there definitive differences between North Bay and South Bay?

Are the habitats that are found in Humboldt Bay unique or can they be found in other bays and estuaries?

Site-specific comments

Humboldt Bay

All constituents were adamantly opposed to a MPA that would encompass both North Bay and South Bay. Several alternatives were proposed to the initial draft concept for the MPA located in Humboldt Bay:

- 1) Restrict the HB-MPA to the region south of a line (270° true) extending through day marker 14, including the old channel adjacent to Kramer Dock. In support of this alternative constituents said there are few South Bay user groups. There are no shipping channels, the area is closed to aquaculture, it is near an established wildlife refuge, and the area is relatively undisturbed by human impact. There may be some resistance to this MPA from adjacent landowners.
- 2) Also proposed was the area east of a line extending approximately north from the hot water discharge pipe to towards the mouth of Elk River. This area was reported to be part of a unique habit because of its position near the harbor entrance. This area is little used by commercial groups although many sport fishers use the breakwater and beach bordering this area.
- 3) An area in the northeast part of the Bay. This area is reported to be closed to aquaculture due to State Health Department and EPA regulation and is unlikely to be developed in the future. There is also a National Wildlife Refuge and Fish and Game property nearby. Not all constituents supported this alternative.

Constituents were united in their support for alternatives 1) and 2) but many expressed staunch opposition to any MPA placed in the North Bay. All were united against any protected area north of the proposed 270° true line. There is concern that proximity to an MPA will result in increased restrictions and permitting processes. The protection of the Red Rock crab fishery was raised as an important issue and all constituents agreed that the fishery should remain unaffected by any MPA placed in Humboldt Bay.

It was reported that Coast Oyster Company uses very little of the land held in their lease. Because of this and because many areas of North Bay are unsuitable for development it was felt that North Bay receives sufficient protection. He said that Coast is very conscientious regarding placement of oyster beds on top of eelgrass beds. All oyster industry representatives said that they are very concerned with maintaining healthy bay ecosystems.

It was also suggested that integrating the findings of the Humboldt Bay Resource Management Plan into the development of an appropriate location for a Humboldt Bay MPA. This has also been suggested at previous small group meetings. One possible problem is that the projected completion of the Management Plan is 18 months, which is does not coincide with the current MLPA deadlines.

It was reported that there is some confusion over the location of the division between North and South Bay. They were not opposed to a MPA south of Hookton Channel, as described above, as long as he was allowed to fish north of that line.

They were interested in abalone mariculture and are concerned about not having access to bull kelp bed now leased to Abalone International in Crescent City.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 27, Santa Barbara Commercial and Environmental (Pt. Conception to Pt. Dume)

General comments

The Channel Islands decision, when made, must be accounted for in MLPA

Phasing should be considered to help limit impacts to consumptive users. This could include “phasing out” existing permits, timed phasing of reserves or other methods.

Participants felt that smaller no-take reserves might be the place to start.

Site-specific comments

Pt. Arguello:

A concern over salmon trolling in this region was raised as well as an environmental group concern over the need for sufficient area.

Pt. Conception:

Consumptive users felt a potential alternative might include part of coho anchorage as long as it did not go past “Perkos”. It was noted that most of the area north of conception was protected by nature, and may not need additional area.

Campus Pt. / Goleta:

Major lobster impacts would be created by no-take reserves in this area. A possible alternative near Elwood was suggested, but would need more input from user groups.

Leo Carillo to Mugu:

Potential alternative exists north of this area, begin with existing reserve at Sycamore Canyon, expand north and south slightly.

Paradise Cove:

It was suggested that a reserve in this area might have large impacts on LA area lobster fishermen who are already limited by the existing Santa Monica Bay closure.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Nov 27, Coalition of Organizations for Ocean Life (general discussion)

General comments only

They believe the composition of the representatives at the facilitated group discussions should reflect the people of California, not just the people who catch fish. We mentioned a

possible optimum-sized group of 15 representatives at each meeting. They felt that only two of these should represent fishing interests, one for recreational and one for commercial.

They stated there should be equal representation between users and non-users. They thought that it would be helpful if there was a “social” event sometime before each meeting at which the representatives could meet each other.

They stated they would like us to not make the revised maps available to the public until after the social function,

They felt we should make known the names of the representatives for the facilitated group discussions as soon as possible.

They believe we should develop a range of map and boundary alternatives, but that the Initial Draft Concept should be the alternative with the lowest amount of area set aside as MPAs.

They felt that the South Central Region had the lowest relative percentage of SMRs among the four regions and that we did not have enough SMRs.

They stated that we should provide higher resolution for our maps available to the public, and include habitat and resources if possible.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Dec 3, Northcoast Environmental Center (North)

General comments

It was discussed that the MLPA and MPA sites are not meant to be used as a fishery management tool. Constituents felt that not enough promotion and education is being enacted to inform the public on the goals and criteria for establishing MPA's. Constituents would like to see the scientific basis for each proposed MPA, specifically which habitat and species each MPA is designed to protect. All constituents agreed that the areas proposed as MPA's should be increased.

They requested that MPA's be made larger so that a “core-buffer-multiple use zone strategy” may be applied. It was felt that current MPA's are too conservative in design and may be difficult to enforce. They requested that a definition of essential habitats be provided for each MPA, along with the level of enforcement to be provided. Another major concern is how the MPA regulations will interact with existing no take zones and regulations. Will the creation of MPA's correspond with protected areas described in management plans such as the Nearshore Fisheries Management Plan? Will MPA's influence future determination of fisheries quotas and gear restrictions?

Constituents at this meeting were also concerned that the absence of an MPA in Humboldt Bay would have negative effects on anadromous fish populations utilizing Humboldt Bay tributaries such as Freshwater Creek, Elk River, Salmon Creek, Jolly Giant Creek and Jacoby Creek.

Site-specific comments

Humboldt Bay:

They proposed a coastwide closure to all commercial fishing inside twenty fathoms. For Humboldt Bay they proposed creating a marine park north of the highway 255 bridge; a conservation area south of the 255 bridge extending to the Bay entrance; and a marine reserve south of the Bay entrance. They expressed support for the existing herring fishery and commercial oyster culture within the North Bay.

Mad River Slough:

They suggested that Mad River Slough be designated a reserve area due to the abundant eelgrass beds and use of the slough by a variety of juvenile fishes and invertebrate species.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Dec 11, Shelter Cove Fishing Industries, (North)

General comments

Shelter Cove constituents were concerned mainly with MPA's in their immediate vicinity.

The issue of jurisdiction over Marine Parks placed adjacent to terrestrial parks was raised. He was concerned that some confusion or conflict may arise if a MPA is subject to regulation from more than one agency.

They suggested a network of areas that would rotate in and out of closed status.

Questions included:

What would be gained by attaching Marine Park status to a protected area?

There was concern with the classification of Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels (CPFV) within protected areas. Would CPFV's be subject to sport or commercial regulations inside Marine Parks and Conservation Areas?

Site-specific comments

Lost Coast, Shelter Cove, Kings Range:

All constituents were against the proposed Lost Coast Reserve and the Shelter Cove Conservation Area. The expansion of the existing Punta Gorda Reserve to create the Kings Range Reserve was also met with resistance.

Usal, Mattole River, Spanich Canyon:

All constituents agreed that they would have no problem with placement of a SMR near Usal and north of the Mattole River. One proposal made by the group was to move the Punta Gorda SMR and the proposed Lost Coast SMR north to the Mattole River and

create a large reserve just below Cape Mendocino. They also agreed that, if necessary, they would tolerate another proposed option, the placement of a SMR at Spanish Canyon along the Lost Coast and a SMR at Usal. All in attendance would like to have an explanation of why an option is chosen. They would also like for the Dept. to keep them informed throughout the process.

Shelter Cove is the least accessible port on the coast and often not fishable due to ocean conditions, therefore Shelter Cove is a natural reserve area already. In regards to the Punta Gorda and Lost Coast Reserves, he said that both these MPA sites would impact the character of the Shelter Cove sport and commercial fisheries. It was reported that the majority of landings from these areas consist of crab, salmon and some halibut. Alternative areas of similar deep water canyon and rocky habitat may be found north of the Mattole River to Davis Creek and out 3.0 nm. All participants present agreed that it is absolutely critical to the community to eliminate the MPA in Delgado Canyon.

It was suggested that central placement of the reserve proposed (north of the Mattole River to Davis Creek and out 3.0 nm) may serve both Shelter Cove and Eureka communities as an MPA. The alternative reserve should remain open to shore fishermen and divers to accommodate the sportfishing community in the Cape Mendocino area.

They suggested presenting four alternatives, rather than three or five, because with any odd number the middle alternative is presumed to represent compromise and therefore predetermines much of the outcome.

They feel strongly that we should put in writing our intention not to restrict non-extractive access in any MPA except on a site-specific basis where justified (marine mammal haulout areas and sensitive tidepool areas were mentioned). They wanted to make a distinction between access and activity.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)